DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 742 UD 015 272

AUTHOR	Burnett, Jacquetta Hill
TITLE	Social Structures, Ideologies, and Culture Codes in Occupational Development of Puerto Rican Youths. Volume 1 of Final Report, Anthropological Study of Disability From Educational Problems of Puerto Rican Youths.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Bureau of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Research and Demonstration Grants.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	336p.; For Volume II, Part I, of this report, see UD015171; For Volume II, Part II, see ED099276
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Failure; Acculturation; Achievement Need; Career Choice; *Cultural Factors; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Anthropology; Educational Needs; Educational Problems; *Employment Problems; Field Studies; *Puerto Ricans; Social Mobility; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	Chicago; Illinois

ABSTRACT

The question of how educational failures lead to or contribute to occupational disability was studied in a youthful Puerto Rican population in an economically poor neighborhood and school district of Chicago. Anthropological field research techniques, supplemented by scheduled interviews and questionnaires, were used to collect qualitative and quantitative data over a two year period, from an original sample of 30 youths, ranging from 13 to 16 years of age, their parents, and their teachers. Quantitative data from youths and parents were analyzed by ethnicity and two categories of length-of-residence on the mainland (non-Puerto Rican families; long-term Puerto Rican families, or short-term Puerto Rican families). Results are stated to show that the Puerto Rican population in this low-income sector contains a probably substantial population of high achievement oriented and upwardly mobile families, as well as Puerto Ricans approximating characteristics commonly used to describe the whole Puerto Rican population. The report concludes, that, in general, lack of motivation or desire seemed not to be the key to the development of educational and career-entry disabilities observed in youths in the area, but rather a lack of several optional means of reaching educational and occupational goals when problems blocked progress. (Author/JM)

5

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

ED107742

SOCIAL STRUCTURES, IDEOLOGIES, AND CULTURE CODES IN OCCUPATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICAN YOUTHS

Volume I

of

Final Report

1

ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF DISABILITY FROM EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICAN YOUTHS

by

Jacquetta Hill Burnett, Director

SRS Grant No. RD-2969 G 69

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FOR REHABILITATION WORKERS

--The Puerto Rican population of a low-income area is not homogeneous with respect to social class, acculturation, or educational and occupational ideology, and contains a probably substantial population of high achievement oriented and upwardly mobile families.

--Acculturation to North American patterns is less adaptive and facilitative to economic mobility and educational mobility in some areas of action than is continued practice and strong conformity to certain traditional Puerto Rican patterns (for example, close supervision and restriction on the physical movement of teenagers or establishing a strong extended family network that acts as a resources pool).

--Not all interpersonal cultural differences in schools were conflictual; not all conflictual cultural differences led to educational disablement and subsequent career-entry disability, unless associated with a form of differentiating social organization that labeled and sorted those with cultural and linguistic differences into low opportunity situations in the school.

--Puerto Rican girls in their early teens suffer stress from cultural differences in sex role code of greater consequence than do Puerto Rican boys and the differences contribute heavily to the probability of a girl leaving school and entering marriage early.

--Eighth grade elementary school teachers were often ignorant of or wrong about Puerto Rican parents' occupational ideology and the high level of their occupational goals and tended to view occupational career entry very narrowly in terms of school-grade levels and achievement test-score-based homogeneous groupings.

--There was serious lack of information on and orientation to occupational and vocational knowledge among parents, teachers, and youths.

--Street gangs served security-giving, resource-pooling, and recreation-organizing functions, but a mini-demonstration pilot program showed they might also serve as job-training recruitment and job-entry support voluntary associations for unemployed and school drop-out youths.

--If cultural or linguistic difference is defined as the source of deficiency, to seek service, Puerto Ricans, or any other cultural minority may have to conceptualize their own cultural background, their native culture as a social disability, or, if professionals come to view certain cultural features as antinomous to rehabilitation and seek to persuade the culturally different client to divest himself of that cultural feature in order to fit into an environment dominated by a different cultural code, the effect of agency policies of this order is to break down distinctive ethnic cultures, to erase cultural pluralism as a condition for entry into economically self-sufficient occupational careers.

ED107742

SOCIAL STRUCTURES, IDEOLOGIES, AND CULTURE CODES IN OCCUPATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICAN YOUTHS*

Volume I

of

Final Report

ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF DISABILITY FROM EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICAN YOUTHS

---

by

Jacquetta Hill Burnett, Director

Spring 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jacquetta Hill
Burnett
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

Available from: Bureau of Educational Research
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

UD 015272

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. RD-2969 G 69 from the Division of Research and Demonstration Grants, Social and Rehabilitative Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Copyright, 1974 © Jacquetta Hill Burnett

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Field studies are as much the work of informants as of the researchers. We gratefully thank all the youths and their families for the long hours they gave in answering our questions and tolerating our presence. Equal thanks are due to the teachers who gave their time and tolerance and always made us feel welcome. The school staff is also due our special thanks. We thank the principal of The Grammar School for his courage in allowing us to be present during difficult times. Of the deceased principal who invited us to do the study in his school, we have the strongest memory of admiration and high regard. We particularly would like to thank the Latin Disciples for enlightening us to entirely new perspectives on street gangs.

We regret we cannot acknowledge each of those persons by name, since protecting their identity helps assure they will suffer no ill effects from the information included in this report.

We can, however, note our thanks to several individuals outside the immediate community of the study. Sam Betances of the Urban Progress Center, now of Northeastern Chicago University, introduced us to the neighborhood. The staff of Casa Central also helped with that introduction. The Reverend José Torres provided us with regular counsel and encouragement. We are deeply grateful for all his efforts on our behalf.

The preparation of the final draft of the manuscript was a monumental task. I would like to thank those who worked on it--Carma Diel, Glenda Rhoads, Valerie Golish, and Rita Quattrocchi--for their good offices toward its completion. Eva L. Santos and James McCorkle joined in the final push in the final stages of production and they have my gratitude for rushing into the breech. I would also like to thank the Bureau of Educational Research and its Director for providing resources toward the final completion of the report.

While the Director has been the sole author of Part I of this report, over the life of the project many people assisted in data collection, processing, analysis, and initial formulation of several of the ideas that appear in this report. I would, therefore, like to thank the following individuals for their contributions.

Maria Cruz
Geoffrey Driver
James Fish
Victor Gonzalez
Dale Good
Tom Herod
Roger Hunt
Sandra Llano
Robert Long
A. Sue Loy, Ph.D.
David Rodriguez
Luis Salces
Henry Slotnick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgment iii

Abstract vi

I. Introduction 1

- A. Background Information 1
- B. Statement of the Problem 2
- C. Review of the Literature 5
- D. Setting 15

II. Methodology 21

- A. Project Program and Staff 21
- B. Population and Sample 24
- C. Dependent and Independent Variables and Hypotheses 32
- D. Data Collection and Analysis 33

III. Results 40

- A. Introduction 40
- B. Migration and the Neighborhood 40
- C. Culture and Social Relations 59
- D. Educational Ideology, Ethnicity, and Social Organization 69
- E. Occupational Ideology 141

IV. Implication of Results 171

V. Summary and Application of Results 179

VI. Footnotes 188

VII. Bibliography 198

VIII. Appendices 205

- A. Appendix A
  - Table 1. The Sociometry of Ethnicity Among Students 206
  - Table 2. Students' Views on Parental Strictness and Control of Spatial Freedom 210
  - Table 3. Students' Views on Culture Coding of Social Relations and on Occupational Ideology 214

Table 4. Students' Views of Ethnicity in the School 220
Table 5. Students' Educational Ideology and Language Attitudes 232
Table 6. Students' Educational Ideology and Reports on Educational Work in the Home 241
Table 7. The Process of Migration and Views of the Neighborhood 246
Table 8. Parents' Occupational Ideology 256
Table 9. Parents' Educational Ideology 267
Table 10. Follow-Up Interviews with Principal Sample Youth: Social Network and Self-Esteem 285
Table 11. Follow-Up Interviews with Principal Sample Youth: Educational Ideology and Culture Coding of Social Relationships 288
Table 12. Follow-Up Interviews with Principal Sample Youth: Occupational Ideology 301
Table 13. Description of Principal Sample Over Time 311

B. Appendix B

1. Methodology 315
2. Results 316
3. Language Usage 323
4. Language Attitude Questionnaire 326

ABSTRACT

The question of how educational failures lead to or contribute to occupational disability was studied in a youthful Puerto Rican population in an economically poor neighborhood and school district of Chicago. Anthropological field research techniques, supplemented by scheduled interviews and questionnaires, were used to collect qualitative and quantitative data over a two year period from an original sample of thirty youths, ranging from thirteen to sixteen years of age, their parents, and their teachers. Quantitative data from youths and parents were analyzed by ethnicity and two categories of length-of-residence on the mainland (NPR refers to non-Puerto Rican; CPR to long-term Puerto Rican families; and PRPR to short-term Puerto Rican families). Results showed the Puerto Rican population in this low-income sector was not homogeneous, but contained a probably substantial population of high achievement oriented and upwardly mobile families, as well as Puerto Ricans approximating characteristics commonly used to describe the whole Puerto Rican population. The hypothesis that greater acculturation among Puerto Rican parents of the youths would be associated with significantly fewer educational problems and failures proved to be inaccurate and misleading from its oversimplification. There were signs of greater acculturation among CPR's than PRPR's, but CPR's sometimes responded to questions in more middle-class terms than the NPR's; in many responses they showed as strong or stronger adherance to Puerto Rican values than did the PRPR's. Qualitative data supplied evidence that the strong conservative practice of certain traditional Puerto Rican patterns by CPR's was more adaptive and facilitative to economic mobility and educational mobility than the practice of the counterpart North American pattern would have been.

Both girls and boys in the sample made career decisions and commitments at extremely early ages, thus decreasing the probability of later job advancement and economic self-sufficiency. Not all intercultural differences were conflictual; not all conflictual cultural differences led to educational disablement. When cultural differences and conflict were associated with differentiating social organization, derived from labeling and sorting differences in culture and language into low opportunity situations, differences were transformed into disabilities. These disabilities gradually led to school failure and drop-out responses. Institutional deficiencies, the lack of provision for, facilities for, and staff competencies to carry out the charter functions of the organization in relation to a population with special needs was a key source of the educational problems and later career difficulties of Puerto Rican youths. The "quickie" transitional programs to get the youths around the need for bilingual-bicultural facilities of an adequate sort not only were wasteful but unsuccessful. In general, lack of motivation or desire seemed not to be the key to the development of educational and career-entry disabilities observed in youths in the area, but rather a lack of "resource redundancy," (the lack of several optional means of reaching educational and occupational goals when problems blocked progress).

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF DISABILITY FROM EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICANS

INTRODUCTION

(a) Background

This project grew out of the increasing realization in the late '60's that not merely poverty groups but certain culturally and linguistically different groups were experiencing serious disadvantages in the occupational marketplace. Evidence of that continued disadvantagement for twelve million Spanish surnamed Americans comes through clearly in grim statistical measures on housing, health, education, unemployment and underemployment. A recent memorandum of The Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People reports that in 1971 Spanish-speaking families had a median income of $7,584, 30% less than the $10,255 of the general population. The same report indicates that 50% of Spanish-speaking youths do not finish high school; only 3% of the Spanish-speaking high school graduates finish college; and fewer than 1% of the Spanish-speaking college graduates are represented in the professions.

These figures suggest the existence of a complex set of occupational problems that have enormous detrimental consequences for people of Spanish-speaking ethnic origin in this country.[1] The concern over the disabling effects of educational failure in youth's ability to establish and develop work careers that provide even average subsistence led to the design of an anthropological study that would investigate the connection between problems in school and early occupational decisions in a population of Puerto Rican youths, one of the large distinctive Hispanic populations in the United States. The high dropout rate from school of this population (estimated informally at 60% by some members of The Chicago Board of Education before we began our study, but reported to be 75% by a study conducted just after our field work ended) suggested that most Puerto Ricans in Chicago schools make life-determining work career decisions very early in their lives and under very difficult circumstances, circumstances that easily lead to highly disadvantaged occupational careers.[2] Our preliminary explorations during the two years prior to our application to SRS established that a large proportion of Puerto Rican youths, by the last year of elementary school (in a kindergarten through eighth grade system) were already overaged by one to two years. Thus, they tended to decide to drop out during the eighth grade and during the first semester of high school. Although this age range is younger than that ordinarily dealt with by SRS, we proposed that a study that focused on the processes of school life and of dropping out during these critical months could provide important information, probably not for preventive programs (largely the egis of the schools), at least information on which to base effective ameliorative and vocationally rehabilitative programs in a population disadvantaged through educational failure and school dropout (which are not always the same thing.)

(b) Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research project was to identify and study, through using anthropological field techniques, the origins of occupational disability in the triadic school-to-home-to-peerdom relationships of Puerto Rican youths in a Chicago inner-urban neighborhood. Our main objective was to develop a set of recommendations based on our findings that may be incorporated into occupational rehabilitation programs for young Puerto Ricans who have left the standard educational system. A secondary objective was to offer key recommendations for programs that could probably reduce the high rate of school leaving among Puerto Ricans and Spanish-speaking ethnics, particularly in the last year of elementary school and the first year of high school.

The main research objective was to focus on cultural patterns that played some part in generating problems in the school environment, in the home environment, or in the relations between any two of these environments. Initially we designed the study, using the concepts of cultural antinomy and cultural complementarity, to assist us in conceptualizing the relationships between Puerto Rican based household culture and the culture of the school. School culture is a professional subculture of educators, derived mainly from the middle-class Anglo cultural tradition, but probably adaptively modified in the rich urban environment of Chicago. By cultural antinomy we referred to the fact that patterns that formed parts (or rule subsets) of any two cultures, when used to govern behavior in given situations, would generate contrariety in the behavior of participants in a given situation; creating the classic condition of culture conflict, or behavioral conflict based on contrary or antinomous sets of rules or principles of action.

The concept of cultural complementarity was used to improve on classic formulations of culture conflict that focused on conflict to the exclusion of the possibility that two cultures in contact might complement and reinforce one another. A classic case of this in American ethnic history is the Jewish pattern of premium respect for the Talmudic scholar, that in a mass educational system allowed generations of Jewish children to pursue this highly valued ideal of the scholar, urged on by highly motivated parents, even in urban ghetto schools--public and private. It so complemented the professional subculture of the school that teaching was easily productive, the challenge being to keep up with the intellectual development of their own students and the demands of the parents. There are other cases of accidental, or perhaps adaptive, complementarity in the history of ethnic processes in the United States, for which our conception allows a place.

In keeping with this view, our definition of culture was based on the explicit distinction between cognized code and action or artifact. Culture consists of rules, which guide behavior and generate new behavior. More specifically the culture of a particular people, or social body, is everything that one must learn in order to behave in ways that are recognizable, predictable and understandable (i.e., explainable) to those people.

We still feel this formulation has great merit in the theory of ethnic encounters and relationships in the institutionalized organizations of complex sociocultural systems. But, as we recount below in the description of our methodology, we found the instrumentality of moving directly from observed events, ethnographically described in research language, to questionnaire or interview is much too crude and instrumentation for collecting countable data on culture rules and patterns. Additional conceptual formulations, developed during the first year of field research assisted us in collecting data and producing results that helped fulfill the primary objectves of the project.

The concept of social network, was fundamental to our methodology, and that concept is dealt with at leangth in the sections on methodology. We began to think of the mass of verbal material we were collecting from our youth samples, their teachers, their parents, and their peers, as ideology--these complex sets of beliefs about schooling, teachers, the schooling process and their relationship to work and occupation. These beliefs we call educational ideology. The complex set of beliefs about work, its relationship to people's lives, and the relationship of education to occupational career sequences, goals, hierarchies, etc., we conceived as *occupational ideology*. It was our proposition that teachers, parents, and students possessed occupational and educational ideologies, and that a key part of our work should be to elicit these ideologies and compare them with one another. This information is discussed in the section on "Results."

Occupational career and *educational career* came to hold a central position in our thinking. Broadly defined, *career* refers to a series of related or describable stages or phases in a given sphere of activity, that a set of people go through in progressive fashion such that one stage or phase usually leads to another, in a given direction, or on the way to a more or less recognizable end point, goal, or series of goals.[3] We assumed there must be some kind of group definition of the end-point, if not the sequence. The movement from one phase to another is *career flow*. The recruitment or entry we viewed as *access* to a career, or *career access*. The exclusion from entry into a sequence of stages or *career sequence* is the negative part of career access, or *career exclusion*. *Preoccupational career* refers to the life-cycle period before career decision or career commitment is made. *Occupational career decision* refers to the fact that some decision in the individual life cycle leads to career access and/or career exclusion. *Certified career entry or career exclusion* refers to the relationship of a certain characteristic, such as educational level, that is required for recruitment or access to a career sequence.

Related to the notion of occupational and educational ideology and work career, was an idea we invented called *information resonance*. This refers to the fact that information enters some social network, particularly a bounded network like a face-to-face group, and ramifies repeatedly throughout that network. This idea we used in relation to information entering the gang network concerning jobs, educational opportunities, and ideology. We also apply it to ethnic groups, in the discussion of our results, and relate it to the informal aspects of socialization, and ethnic adaptation to a new environment.

We invented and used the idea of *redundancy of opportunity*, in the sense of back-up options, in order to refine the notion of opportunity structure in relation to our poverty-level population. Redundancy here means abundance of alternatives or options in relation to educational and occupational careers. It is very important to conceptualize the relation of limited resources, including limited economic ones, to career access and exclusion.

We utilized two well-known anthropological concepts "culture broker" and "voluntary association" in our discussion of the gangs. They will be explained in those contexts.

Finally in the discussion of results we re-examine the idea of disability in relation to cultural difference. In this context we discuss the unintended conceptual developments and policy effects that can arise from the use of a medical or disease research-service model in dealing with culturally defined social disabilities. We also employ the concept of migration, particularly with reference to migrant movements. This general idea is then related to refluent migration, domestic cycle, and life cycle in order to better understand some of the significant ecological conditions of Puerto Rican life cycles that distinguish them from other groups of Spanish-speaking origin and from other immigrant groups to the United States.

The additional conceptual elaboration that characterized the second year of our research was set in motion by the repeated observation that culture differences and contrasts did not in themselves set in motion conflictual relationships and encounters. We found that some other notable contrasts in culture were overlooked or tolerated in very indulgent ways. The conflictual value of a culture-code difference depended on whether or not it was picked up and incorporated in the social organization of the institution and whether it contributed to sorting into stratified and superordinate-subordinate hierarchies. This process we propose underlies the transformation of cultural difference into social disabilities, and it is thus not the cultural differences in themselves that generate disadvantaged conditions in the lives of the culture carriers. It thus becomes our task in this report to delineate this process of transforming differences into deficits as it manifested itself during a two year period for a sample of Puerto Rican youths in an urban Chicago neighborhood.

(c) Review of the Literature

The literature on Puerto Ricans on the mainland has understandably focused mainly on Puerto Ricans in the northeast, particularly in the New York and New Jersey areas. Recently, however, there are increasing numbers of studies focusing on other urban centers of the United States, particularly in the midwest, that are relevant to Puerto Rican colonias and enclaves.[4] This study is one of the few empirical studies reporting on Puerto Ricans in Chicago. There are clear signs of the neglect, in the literature, of other centers of Puerto Rican settlement, although it is changing rapidly.[5]

The emphasis on New York City's Puerto Rican population is understandable since it was the focal point of the Puerto Rican movement to the mainland during the 1950's.[6] In the late 1960's, much of the literature on Puerto Ricans recognized for the first time that culture was a significant consideration. Even so the programmatic literature, that is, literature describing what was to be done about Puerto Rican culture in institutions and agencies was preponderantly and blatantly patronizing, emphasizing more efficient conversion to mainstream patterns so as to displace "deficient" Puerto Rican culture. At that time cultural difference was viewed as the source of most of the Puerto Ricans' problems.[7] This perspective is well illustrated in the educational area by a description of a program sponsored by the Hoboken, New Jersey Board of Education. The title of the document, "Operation Assimilation through Cultural Understanding" and its stated purpose of aiding teachers and administrators working with "unassimilated and linguistically handicapped children in an inner city environment," underlines the "social engineering" view of cultural understanding.[8] That is, studies of culture were mainly undertaken for the purpose of more efficiently displacing the original culture and language and converting the culturally different to mainstream culture patterns. In this approach cultural understanding was to be used for its own destruction.

Another point of view was, however, that destruction of native culture was what lead to the emergence of the culture of poverty.[9] This perspective often included not simply the idea that a traditional culture was to be preserved, but that culture was a viable changing, adapting phenomenon that, in urban settings like New York City, was showing signs of syncretic development of a new variant of culture that was a combination of Puerto Rican traditions and the tradition of urban New York City. But the hard realities of urban political economics soon transformed this position into a position holding that culture preservation itself was not going to assure the conditions for retaining culture difference. That is, culture preservation would not provide the means to economic well-being and social class mobility. Groups were seen to need structural opportunities.[10] Then, with the developing understanding of the conditions that had so disastrously inhibited economic and social mobility of American Blacks, a further theoretical position, the power-participation position, took hold.[11] It emphasized the political voice of migrants, immigrants, and minorities, and their distribution within the host society's institutional complexes.[12]

With this political-action approach scholars began to re-examine some of the assumptions regarding presumed deficiencies from cultural and linguistic differences. The corollary to this new concept of structure and political power was cogently expressed much earlier by Clarence Senior, a long respected scholar of Puerto Rican experience in the U.S., when he noted the key to majority-minority group relations is not the differences per se, but the host society's, or the dominant societal segments, reactions to those differences.[13] For example, the host society had long regarded Spanish-speaking parents' preference to speak Spanish, rather than English, in the home as one of those cultural-linguistic differences that gives rise to deficiencies, particularly in academic achievement.

Fennesey, in a re-analysis of the non-English-speaking segment of a nation-wide sample of Puerto Rican children, controlled for other variables, such as class-related variables, which are often confounded with language, and found there was no significant difference between average test scores of the children from Spanish-speaking homes and English only homes, except in the first grade.[14] This finding complements the results of our own pilot language study that the English code of Puerto Rican youth is like that of their peers and siblings, suggesting that peers, and older and same age siblings, are the learning sources of the English they speak.[15]

Studies of social mobility of Puerto Ricans, since it concerns the relation of education, occupation, and income, are of direct relevance to this study. Kantrowitz, using 1950 and 1960 census data from metropolitan New York, studied the social mobility of second generation children of migrants who were 25 years or older. Because sizeable Puerto Rican immigration is so recent, and mainland born Puerto Ricans are so few, this sample consisted of only 2.4% of the 629,430 Puerto Ricans in New York.[16] He concluded the children are better off than their parents were, and thus, were upwardly mobile from 1950 to 1960 by the common criteria of attaining some high school education, attaining certain white-collar jobs, and to a lesser extent, attaining higher incomes, when compared to New York's "other whites." But there are interesting and less optomistic qualifications. Their mobility into the white-collar work was mainly into lower-level clerical and sales positions, but they showed little more than average mobility into professional and technical categories. Even by 1960 their attainment of manager-proprietor or craftsman-foreman ranks lagged behind statistical expectancy. In summary, in 1960 the picture was that even second generation Puerto Ricans were having difficulty in getting to the educational level of some college and college graduation. When they did, they apparently had access to professional and technical positions. With lesser levels of education, they rapidly moved into lower-level white-collar and sales positions, but showed serious deficiency in "promotional" accessing to manager-proprietor positions or craftsman-foreman positions. Clearly the Puerto Rican mobility was a failure in the blue-collar world of craftsman-foreman. Moreover, because of the barriers or social resistence in promotional routes to higher level occupations, it may be that the rapid, successful movement into lower-level sales and clerical positions in fact represents a movement into dead-end jobs. Yet it also seems clear that where the occupational system of New York City has been open to them, second-generation Puerto Ricans have done well in translating their education into white-collar positions.

Our study did not include more than one Chicago-born adult, but the CPR adults reflected in their interviews a picture very similar to that suggested by Kantrowitz's study. A similar study using 1970 Census data is warranted, but it appears that either Chicago is reduplicating in the 1960's New York City's experience of one decade earlier, or social-occupational mobility patterns, have not changed in general character for the Puerto Ricans between 1960 and 1970.

One of the striking results of this study is the pivotal significance of educational level to Puerto Ricans in the face of discriminatory resistance of work institutions to their internal mobility to employment. Yet, it should be noted, the resistance cannot be entirely a matter of the most popular explanation, lack of English, since Kantrowitz studied only second-generation Puerto Ricans, who presumably are fluent in English.

Refluence. One of the important factors in the lives of Puerto Rican youth, and in the educational arrangements for them, that this study discovered and emphasized, was the return to Puerto Rico. Four out of twenty Puerto Rican youths returned to the Island, all from the group of Puerto Ricans of short-term residence.

Myers and Masnick, estimating in what we judge to be very loose terms, (using Hernandez-Alvarez's estimated 83,000 Puerto Ricans returning between 1955 and 1963) claim a return "of over 10% of the migrants who came to the United States after 1940."[17] They do not explain very clearly the basis for their arithmetic, but if our results regarding heavy returns among recent arrivals is correct, 10% is probably a significant underestimation. Moreover, it is not clear that these returns did not include visits, whereas Petersen's estimate of 25% refluence for other immigrants between 1908 and 1923 admittedly does confound the two.[18] There appears to be some propensity to underestimate the significance of refluence for Puerto Rican migration to the mainland.[19] The Puerto Rican case poses many exceptions to the established theories of migration and, thus, poses special problems for both the social scientists, with their general concepts, and the agencies, with their general policies.

Studies of Puerto Rican Acculturation. A number of studies have been carried out in New York City concerning acculturation. Adaptive acculturation clearly was taking place there. Those working out of demographic and census data tended to claim rapid assimilation of Puerto Ricans, but always with qualifications about some peculiar features of the assimilation. But the main burden for the judgment of rapid assimilation is carried by reports of out-group marriage, surely significant, but clearly to be cautiously regarded in terms of the well-noted tolerance of Puerto Ricans toward intergroup interaction and intermarriage.[20] Many of the demographic changes on which Macisio bases his strong, but qualified, claims for assimilation are demographic features that were changing during the same period and in the same direction on the Island.[21] This particular case illustrates, from our point of view, one of the most general errors committed by social scientists and social service program developers with respect to Puerto Ricans: the failure to take into account what is happening on the Island as well as what is happening on the mainland, since both are undergoing rapid development, in order to properly assess what is happening to Puerto Ricans because of their mainland experience and what is true or is taking place as a function of conditions and processes both on the Island and on the mainland.

Social anthropological and clinical studies in _situ_ on acculturation have been carried out, but almost exclusively in New York. Mencher studied the relationship of family form; nuclear type versus extended type, (but extended by female members) and the adaptation of childrearing practices to urban, mainland--mainly New York City--environment.[22] Seda Bonilla studied the relation of cultural norms for statuses and role relationships in the family to stability and change in various life situations.[23] Susana Bouquent found acculturation of Puerto Rican boys between ten and twelve to mainland attitudes toward Negroes and Whites was related to length of residence but not to whether they were light-skinned or dark-skinned.[24]

A number of clinical studies of Puerto Ricans were also done during this period.[25] Ill health has been a prevalent problem of the Puerto Ricans but it seems to play a special role in connection with occupational difficulties of the Puerto Rican males. Dr. Beatrice Bishop Berle, who studied the health problems of a sample of eighty Puerto Rican families, points out that the importance of dignity and self-respect to a Puerto Rican man makes it particularly difficult for him to accept relief when he cannot provide for his own family and progress economically. But if he suffers from understandable and acceptable misfortune, through accident or ill health and cannot work, there is no shame in requiring public assistance. Dr. Berle describes the situation thus:[26]

> . . . Failure is inevitable when discrepancy between an individual's aspirations and the limited employment opportunities open to him due to lack of schooling or special skill cannot be reconciled. To prove illness so that one may be cared for then becomes a vital necessity.

She notes a high incidence of new cases of tuberculosis and high admission rate to mental hospitals. Other studies corroborate the discovery of the exceptionally high rate of impairment for Puerto Ricans in New York.[27] Migration for the Puerto Rican, then, seems to take high toll in areas of health.

Another classic study of Padilla's Up from Puerto Rico complements Berle's detailed description of Puerto Ricans' culture mapping of sickness and disability, and its relationship to the utilization of medical and social welfare services.[28] Many of Padilla's ethnographic generalizations are repeated in the report of our results. One concept, also present in Mencher, was recognition of the importance of the children confined closely to the house or apartment, hijos de la casa, particularly during the early years of childhood. As we pointed out in our study, this same constriction of physical mobility has been adaptively extended upward in the age hierarchy for both boys and girls, particularly for CPRs. It seems to be related to upward mobility and protection from the behavioral and value influences of a poor, lower-class neighborhood operating in the streets.[29]

With respect to the school-household relationship, Mencher argued that the form of extended family typical of Puerto Ricans on the Island is more successful in supporting health accommodation to U.S. urban life than is the atrophied nuclear family form of the North American Anglo middle class.[30] A key element in the balance of role function in the Island family is an indulgent grandparent generation, particularly the grandmother, to offset the effects of severe, even harsh, discipline by the child's parents. In the absence in the U.S. of indulgent female relatives, many young Puerto Ricans tend to expect the school to serve as the potential functional equivalent--only to suffer rejection and disappointment, finding only another site of severe discipline. Clearly, there is a social-shock effect and apparent loss of customary means of social control in the difference in family structure and community relations that the ecology of northern urban centers imposes on Puerto Rican arrivals. Their first problem seems to be the lack of functional equivalents in the new environment to sustain basic cultural processes while they deal with the pressing immediate demands for change in overt behavior with respect to North Americans.

Padilla also raises the question of subgroupings within the New York Puerto Rican population. In addition to the usual second generation and first generation migrant subgroups commonly distinguished in demographic models, she suggests there is a third subgroup of first generation long-term residents. Much of her contrastive analysis however, is made in terms of more recent arrivals and those who were born on the mainland or arrived early in their childhood. Our CPR youth sample corresponds to that distinction, but we also found their parents represent a distinct subgroup within the general Puerto Rican population that warrants separate treatment.

O'Neill and O'Neill carried out a study of physically handicapped Puerto Ricans that found them extremely isolated, even from other

Puerto Ricans, but still sharing many of the characteristics of the Puerto Rican population in general: strong work maxim; wanting jobs that were modal types for jobs held by Puerto Ricans; having little sophistication toward job training programs, but being mainly concerned with obtaining jobs, yet valuing formal education in a generalized way; lack of a clear framework for understanding agency services and apparent problems from the lack of bicultural-bilingual professional personnel in the agencies they dealt with.[31]

Formal Education and the Puerto Ricans. Throughout the literature one finds constant reference to two salient features of Puerto Rican migration. One is the fact that migration rates have been tied closely to favorable employment conditions in the United States; with rapid economic development of the Puerto Rican economy one can anticipate that more recent figures will show it increasingly related to fluctuating business and employment conditions on the Island.

The second salient feature is the changing status of women. Their increased freedom is constantly mentioned. Even the conflict engendered by the dependence of family reputation on daughters' virginity into marriage and the conflicts over close scrutiny and constriction of social life of girls on the mainland. But no study reviewed goes on to point out the "life career" consequences of this conflict in terms of restricted access to further education and occupational mobility, despite the high rate (over 40%) of employment among Puerto Rican women.

The educational literature has tended to be assimilationist, in the displacement sense, as we noted earlier.[32] More recently the literature has taken on the compensatory educational approach, with particular focus on language learning.[33] The recognition of the significance of understanding cultural difference was mainly to be seen in terms of speeding up the process of assimilation.[34] But now bicultural-bilingual programs are being emphasized, with greater consideration being given to the school's role in promoting cultural pluralism on the one hand and academic achievement on the other.

Gordon and Wilkerson report that research and trial programs forcefully underlined the facts of the particular significance of the psychological concepts of "self-concept" and "expectation" to effective educational preparation, including occupational preparation of the culturally different and disadvantaged for equal participation in larger society.[35] So important are the embodied dynamics of expectation that the HARYOU project report of 1964, Youth in the Ghetto could argue:

> On the evidence available to date, it must be concluded that the major reason why an increasing number of central Harlem pupils fall below their grade levels is that substandard performance is expected of them. (p. 237.)[36]

A more sociocentric expression of this position is that such social structural arrangements as "tracking" the students of urban schools effectively controls their future goals and molds their self-concept. So, by structure and by self-expectation, they can go only down and out of the school, and eventually in and out of the labor force.[37]

Much to the point of our project is "The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957," carried out for the Board of Education of New York.[38] The study emphasized how much the public school serves as a first point of contact for Puerto Ricans with North American institutions. Moreover, they suggested that Puerto Rican parents' attitudes toward the schools were colored significantly by the degree to which the school responded effectively in the role of help, referral, and protection. On language learning, one investigation found that children who were interested in and showed satisfaction with learning English usually had ". . . someone--an older sibling, relative, or friend--from whom he was learning English words." Certain problems with learning English were found to be associated with the fact that the student's peer group and the teacher, respectively, spoke different dialects of English, thus producing "interference" problems in learning English. The study also raised the point that Puerto Rican children undergo culture shock and the stress is exacerbated and prolonged by certain classroom practices.

As we indicated in the description of our population, there were an estimated 27,000 Puerto Rican students in Chicago schools when this study began. In 1970 Lucas surveyed dropouts in the school district in which our study took place.[39] It was clear that the unofficial estimate of a 60% dropout rate we had obtained "unofficially from official sources" was probably an underestimation. Lucas claimed an estimated dropout rate of 75%. While Lucas' study suffers from some frustrating inadequacies (such as failure to report frequencies and "n's" on which his percentages in the tables are based) it is the only survey of dropout rates and reasons for leaving for this population. Following along the lines of Havighurst's calculations one can conclude that the Puerto Rican community is contributing relatively heavily to the pool of marginal youth in Chicago. This condition underlines the particular necessity to continue the search for means and methods for approaching better education, both outside formal schooling as well as within formal schools, of Puerto Rican youth. In his study of the public schools of Chicago, Havighurst argued that only a more successful program in the schools for disadvantaged, potentially marginal youth, that will hold them in the schools and teach them more, can really change employment conditions for youth and make it easier for them to get jobs.[40] Havighurst pointedly emphasized the importance of coming to grips with the fact of the presence in seventh and eighth grades of a large pool of over-aged, near marginal youth that contribute heavily to the discipline problems and lost educational efforts that dominate the reputation of the upper grade centers of Chicago. Upper grade centers are a notable but still less than adequate effort to deal with this pool of likely marginals. He argued that fresh new approaches to the education of these youths must be developed in these centers. Following Havighurst's train of calculations, one can conclude that the Puerto Rican community is contributing relatively heavily to the pool of marginal youth in Chicago. This "calculated" condition underlines the particular necessity to search and research for means and methods for approaching education of Puerto Rican youth.

In their appraisal of educational programs for the disadvantaged, Gordon and Wilkerson indicated that although enthusiasm was high and programs were extremely varied, the total actual effect was neither clear nor impressive.[41] Neither effective program evaluations nor census surveys provided us with evidence that the flurry of recent activity had had actual effect, and Gordon and Wilkerson were concerred that they had not lived up to their ambitious hopes. Many of the programs were ineffective in developing long-term employment for marginal youth.[42]

Gordon and Wilkerson provided a valuable compendium and assessment of compensatory education programs, including vocational programs for dropouts. They note that 93% of the programs have begun since 1960, and 43% since 1963. From their catalogue of programs, it is clear that Chicago is at no loss for efforts in compensatory education and vocational education, including efforts that affect the Puerto Ricans. Educational and Vocational Guidance Centers; the Urban Youth Program that emphasized counseling, a work-study program, and short-term pre-employment training; Day School and After School Reading Clinics; a summer enrichment program for eighth grade graduates; I See Chicago and Project Apex; co-operative education programs that provide supervised on-the-job training as a feature of the regular educational programs; the Impact or Improvement of Attendance and Curtailment Training; Opportunity Rooms for non-English-speaking children, until they can be moved into the regular school program; the Adult Education Center that includes literacy training and Americanization courses; and other programs are going on in Chicago. The authors' remark that if success could be evaluated simply on the basis of the amount of enthusiasm and activity generated by the efforts, they would at once declare the majority of the programs studied successful. They go on, however, to state that:[43]

> For all their variety of means, the programs have generally suffered from one fundamental difficulty--they are based on sentiment rather than on fact. Or, at best, those facts on which they are based are the obvious ones: that a population exists which is not able to benefit from the education being served up by the schools, that that population has certain common characteristics (the programs are less likely to be sensitive to the difference). . .

Not only must a good deal more be known in the case of particular programs for particular populations, but also a basic re-orientation to the demands of genuine resolution must be made. Whom are we trying to change? Must programs concentrate efforts on the children; the schools have not taken on the burden of finding new and different educational techniques, and even goals, appropriate to the children's needs. The programs with dropouts, the authors say, reflect this. They try to help with more of the things already known--more guidance, more remedial reading, more vocational information, more enrichment activities. Often they amount to luring the dropout back to school to "become an unemployed high school graduate" rather than an unemployed dropout.

The authors go directly to the heart of a basic flaw in dropout programs which represent the last intervention of the school into the lives of these (disadvantaged) youth. They say:

> Where dropout programs operate on the junior high school level . . . they are more likely to be effective.

It is the sad fact that a high school dropout or any young person simply waiting in school to reach the age when he can drop out tends to be a youth for whom school has represented perennial failure.

The second telling point these authors make with respect to dropout programs is that their real failure is

> . . . The failure of the school to identify those approaches to curriculum content and organization that take into account the special learning problems of persons who are essentially adult, but developmentally handicapped.

Merely to hold these young people or attract them back to school only to have them learn that the school really has not "the capability to insure them achievement of literacy, of concept mastery, and of ability to utilize new knowledge," Gordon and Wilkerson say means " . . . we cannot claim success for anti-dropout programs."

(d) Setting.

The general setting of the study was a Puerto Rican neighborhood in Chicago, an urban setting that was mainly comprised of families in low income brackets; many of the Puerto Rican families had an income of $2,000.00 a year, or less, from the head of the household. Thus, it was a neighborhood in which often both parents worked in order to garner sufficient income to meet the cost of living at a time when the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago estimated a family of four needed $9,190 to enjoy a moderate standard of living. It was a neighborhood in which many of the families were on welfare including not only Puerto Ricans but the NPR population. It was a setting in which LADO, an organization of welfare recipients, had a very active life. The neighborhood was located near a large park, Von Humbolt Park, and was often called the Von Humbolt area. More often the area was referred to as the Division Street area, after one of the main east-west thoroughfares, made famous by Studs Terkel's book, Division Street, U.S.A.

The prevalence of the Puerto Rican population, along Division Street, did not become obvious until one crossed Ashland Avenue going west. There Spanish-language signs and the dress and appearance of the pedestrians suddenly signaled a change in the ethnicity of the inhabitants of the neighborhood's buildings. And, to the more discerning observer, there were other signs, such as graffiti on the walls and buildings revealing territorial markings of Hispanic street gangs--Latin Kings, Youngbloods, Spanish Lords, Latin Disciples--gang names written beside Spanish slogans. The Hispanic character of the area became more and more prevalent as one moved west until suddenly one had traversed Von Humbolt Park, where the ethnic signs along Division Street suddenly changed to those of North European languages and to English. Puerto Rican and Hispanic markers quickly disappeared as one moved west.

The boundaries of the Puerto Rican section seemed less regularized as one moved either north or south of Division Street or North Avenue. The number of blocks one could go before the Hispanic markers disappeared, when one moved north or south from Division Street, depended on where along the east-west compass one decided to move north or south. This was because the Spanish surname population in the area was distributed in an east-by-northeasterly direction, from as far south as Madison Street and to the 4800 block west. In the southerly direction toward the west were Blacks. North and west were Polish and other North-European names and ethnic populations. The census tracts and the school survey of student ethnicity reveals this particular shape and directional movement of the Spanish-speaking population, mainly Puerto Rican to the north, but probably more of Mexican origin to the South. To the far North and East, the Puerto Rican population blends with the Cuban population. To the farthest northerly and easterly segment where the Hispanic population has any significant representation in the student body of the school, there is an increasing incident of the category of other ethnic groups which may indicate its confluence with the American Indian population in that area.

Thus, the setting of research was in an Hispanic geographical area. Our research concentrated within this geographical area and the neighborhood around The Grammar School,[44] whose student body was 80.2% Puerto Rican (or more accurately Hispanic and Spanish surnames by teacher's headcount) as well as in the neighborhood around Division High School of which the student body was approximately 46.2% Puerto Rican in 1969.[45]

During the spring and summer of 1968, the Director worked out of a storefront building diagonally across the street from The Grammar School. For part of the summer, we were given permission to use one of the classrooms in the school for our "recreational" work with neighborhood girls and for other work connected with the pilot stages of the project. As we worked in and out of the storefront and school, we established initial contacts with the older students in the school, as well as with their families; school officials; leaders of local associations; government officials who had offices located around or near the Division Street Area; policemen; gang members; and in sum, a full cross-section of the various roles and positions represented in a community and neighborhood of this sort in an urban setting. By June of the summer of 1968, we had drawn our sample of cases that we would attempt to follow during the two-year period from 1968 through the end of the summer of 1970. Thus the summer months preceding the project were spent establishing the basis for swiftly contacting sample youths and their families during the fall months.

In the fall of 1968, the storefront room was to be used as a project office and also as a kind of recreational center in which we could work with our sample youth and their peers. We began using the center as a recreation spot for the girls in our sample population, and their friends; a place where they could gather after school. In this way, we hoped to study at first-hand the peer relations among the girls and perhaps later among the boys as we attracted them to the center. For cultural reasons, that we discuss at length under Section 3: Results; the mixing of sexes in the same setting did not work out at all, even for junior-high-age youths of Puerto Rican background.

Nevertheless, the storefront was the project's center throughout the field phase of the project. Later, during the second year of our operation, the center actually became a recreation center for a street gang, the Latin Disciples. This aspect of the project is also discussed under "Results."

The neighborhood had both single family homes and apartment buildings. The apartment buildings however, were usually no more than four or five floors high and often afforded rather large and many-roomed apartments. The streets around the school, and the houses where our sample families lived, became very familiar to the staff of the project during the two and one-half years the director and various project staff worked in the field. Indeed, we became as familiar to the people who used the streets regularly as they came to be with us. Often we greeted acquaintances and persons who were part of our sample network, stopping to talk with them and to exchange news. The field notes from our fieldworkers often include references to having to run into one of our sample informants on the street, perhaps after having tried in vain several times to find someone at the home, and then and there seizing the opportunity, at the invitation of the informant, to accompany him to his home in order to do the interview.

The Grammar School during 1968-69 came to be familiar territory for the staff, particularly during the school year, while we were doing in-classroom and around-the-school participant observation of the students, of teachers and of student-staff interaction, and of student-student interaction. Regrettably we did not have the same opportunity to become intimately acquainted with Division High School and its branch school. After the 1969-70 school year began we were refused permission by the Principal of Division High School to follow our sample students into the school and the classrooms in the fashion that we had been allowed to in The Grammar School. The refusal did not seriously change the data we collected from our sample, but it did limit our intimate knowledge of Division High School as an interactive system. We could not add accounts of participant observation of the events that actually took place to the interview data from the sample.[46] However, the storefront center continued to provide us with close contact with high school students so that we were able to include, as part of our field data, an account of events that were taking place in the high school. Indeed, we were able to get acquainted with several of the teachers from the high school through our social network in the Disciple street gang and through other kinds of contacts. Thus, we feel that the refusal to allow us to do participant observation in The High School did not seriously limit the data we were able to gather from our sample regarding educational problems and their relationship to occupational career development.

The field data was collected in the area described above. However, the data itself was processed and analyzed in the University offices in Urbana. The materials were sent down or carried back and forth because the Director went back and forth each week and was able to carry copies of data down to the University offices and to carry forms and other materials and information back to the urban setting. In some measure this tended to intensify our urban field staff's involvement with the neighborhood since they used the storefront as the home base for the study, rather than a University building within the city proper, which might have been the case had the main University office been located in Chicago.

There are some other particular characteristics of the setting that heavily influenced the conduct of the research and should be mentioned here, because these conditions of the setting affected the lives of our target population as well as ourselves. These factors are part of the "ecology" of the setting that affect anyone who spends a great deal of time in that area. They are discussed here as part of the setting because we both discovered them and found that they heavily affected the design and the conduct of the study. We use the word "design" advisedly, for it implies somehow that the persons who conduct the research are in control. The reality is, however, that even once the design apparently articulates well with the problem in mind, the population and its location, the researcher is often and at many points out of control of the execution of his design as it is initially set up. Indeed, he finds his design controlled by other people whose cooperation is needed and by the course of events in the environment in which the research takes place, particularly in field research.

One of the first realities of the setting that affected the research was the fact that the neighborhood was dangerous to people, particularly at night if one were alone and on foot. This reality not only affected our conduct, but it plagued and worried our informants and was often a subject they dwelt upon during the course of an interview concerned with another subject. The fear generated out of this condition affected the way in which we decided to approach members of the household. The fear that they felt often meant that when we approached the apartment door of a family, if it were for initial interview and they did not know us, we might find them apparently not at home when they were at home. We could not expect them to believe us even when they acknowledged their presence through the door when we attempted to explain why we were knocking on their door. More importantly we could not readily expect that they would let us in, although we learned that being female helped in this instance. With the Puerto Rican families, being a Spanish-speaking female increased the probability of being allowed in.

There was another complication in this respect when a male member of the staff came to an apartment where only the women and children were present, or if the wife of the household was alone. It was very inappropriate for the staff member to enter then, in order to do an interview, and under these circumstances it was often necessary for a female staff member to accompany him. Thus the design of our research to begin with a cohort of youth in the schools whom we could contact in the school and then use their household as our sample household was in part an adaptation of the design to the conditions of the setting in which the research took place.

While we often used the streets of the neighborhood during the day, we used cars and went in pairs to evening interviews and other events requiring that we move through the neighborhood at night. This was a rule we insisted on for our staff, both male and female, except in very unexpected emergencies. Furthermore, during the second year of the project, when the staff was concentrating on family interviews and thus moving about the streets very often, female interviewers were sent out in pairs. These behavioral codes were urged on the director from the very beginning because during the preliminary stages of the pilot context, prior to SRS funding, a young Puerto Rican man who worked with the project for a short time was robbed one evening on his way home from an interview. Incidents happened from time to time, not only to people we knew through our extensive social networks, but to our informants and members of the more immediate social network. There were some "close calls" that occurred to our staff, but no serious injuries actually occurred.

One potentially dangerous encounter occurred because of our association with the Latin Disciples, a factor in our favor in their territory, but a potentially dangerous factor when one of our case-study families lived in another gang's territory. The boundaries of the street gangs affected us, but they also taught us at the same time that they would probably play a part in any demonstration program that took place in the area. This illustrates then how our own adaptation to the setting helped educate us about conditions and factors in the lives of the population in the neighborhood that should be taken into account in planning programs that had close contacts with the neighborhood.

A third factor of the setting that became important to us was that the 1968-70 period of the study was the peak time for ghetto riots and the general aggressive unrest that characterized many ghetto areas of the country. A riot had occurred along Division Street during the summer of 1968. But our project dealt mainly with the aftermath of the riot: fear, suspicion, distrust, anger and initially the possibility that we represented, in some way, the establishment. Property damage that characterized other ghetto areas in the city also came to affect us and indeed our budget. The most expensive item on the upkeep of the storefront center was replacement of front glass windows. Each time there was an incident somewhere in the neighborhood that might generate some restless movement, glass was a particularly inviting object of property on which to vent one's feelings. Each time the glass breakage occurred, there were different circumstances and it appeared that different people were involved; but we, like the grocery store across the street and countless other storefronts in the neighborhood, suffered the consequences of living behind a great and inviting expanse of glass.[47]

A fourth factor affecting our research was the residential mobility of the people living in the area. In general, people moved from one apartment to another within the area, or from the neighborhood to suburban homes. Puerto Ricans often returned to Puerto Rico. Non-Puerto Ricans often moved to another state, city or town where jobs might be better. Professionals in the institutions in the neighborhood commonly thought the Puerto Ricans, for some "cultural reason," were highly mobile and transient. But information from our NPR comparison group suggests that it is more likely that this transience is a general characteristic of a poor population moving into a poor neighborhood, for a number of ecological reasons. However, the general transience of the population quickly underlined the futility of the effort at maintaining an unbiased, stratified, randomly-selected sample of youths and families. Thus the technical control over the mechanisms to assure an unbiased representative sample of cases was eaten away by the conditions of the setting and by factors over which we had no hope of control, or over which we finally had to give up control (e.g., initial acceptance of interviews but later rejection of continuing with it).

In summary then, the setting of this research along with its duration in that setting, shaped, changed, and altered the original plans, and the relative accomplishment of initial goals. At the same time the alterations of conditions and adaptations to them became part of the results of the study which we report below. It reflects then, that the individuals in the research were not only participants and observers but in a larger sense that the research itself was a participant in the life of the community and the setting of that community.

METHODOLOGY

(a) Project Program and Staff

Since this project was in the main a research project, the project staff was mainly a research staff of field workers collecting observational and interview data and a data processing staff that coordinated the collection of data, as well as processed and analyzed the data. (This part of the staff and operation will be described with the discussion of data collection.) In addition, we established a small scale "demonstration" project, in combination with a data collection arrangement, with a street gang in the neighborhood in which our project was carried out. The contact with the street gang offered us a means to supplement and enrich our understanding of peer relations in the neighborhood. The programmatic part of the project allowed us to test out, or elaborate on the conception of "resource redundancy" or more accurately for the target group of this project "limited resource redundancy."

The basic idea is simply that when problems arise, people with a redundancy of resources have several optional back-up solutions to resort to should their first efforts to reach some goal fail. Thus, we often observed that goal attainments failed in our population not because of lack of motivation to achieve a goal, but because of limits on alternative and optional means of reaching goals. Thus, we saw the Center as an additional source of resources to gang members who were attempting to accomplish certain goals in life, but had few optional means to the goals. Through the contact with the storefront Center staff they could access an additional set of "back-up means" in the form of information, know-how, and emotional support (see below). We focused our "limited" resources on occupational and educational goals, but because of the form of our staff's relationship to the gang, these were not the only kinds of goal attainments we found ourselves lending support to.

A second, and perhaps more important part of the demonstration project was the idea of using a "natural" social organizational form indigenous to the neighborhood to deliver human services, as contrasted with the usual plan of developing a special organizational form that accesses the agencies' services but which clients or potential clients must learn to follow (procedures often thought of pejoratively by clients as "red tape").

These objectives generated very special requirements of the staff working with the gang. Even so the specific nature of these requirements was not immediately obvious to us but evolved with the growth of our research staff's relation with the gang. To summarize the staff person who supervised the gang had to meet gang criteria of leadership as well as project criteria. The combination of the two sets of criteria placed him in a "broker" or "man-in-between" position. We learned that from the gang's point of view our supervisor had first of all to "be able to handle himself physically."

Secondly he had to be bilingual. Third he had to be naturally "sympatico" or a sympathetic, warm, personable, friendly person. He had to be young enough to blend in with the 13-to-20 year olds of the gang. And he had to be male. From the project's point of view he had to be a good participant observer; a diligent field-note keeper; and someone who could ajudicate the sometimes conflicting demands and needs of the research project and the gang and its members. Finally, he had to have the ability to allow the leaders of the gang to be the leading authorities, not subordinate to him, and yet maintain an acceptable degree of conformity to the rules of operation of the center.

As part of our effort to use the natural indigenous organizational form, we hired the gang leader and the vice president of the gang as para-professional recreational leaders for the center. This was an official means of recognizing the gang's own organization, and it meant we would be utilizing indigenous neighborhood leaders on our staff who could, if we listened and adjusted appropriately, develop policies better adapted to the realities of the neighborhood.

Our association with the Latin Disciples was a natural consequence of our using a store front office next to their temporary gang quarters in the basement of a house next door to the store front. We were attempting to use the store front center for activities for the Puerto Rican girls in our sample. But one of the hard lessons we were learning from that effort was that we could not run a mixed sex center. We were attempting to establish a girls' recreational club to help increase contacts with girls' peer network. The parents of our sample girls were adamently against allowing their daughters to go to the "club" when they knew there were boys of the girls' age, or older, around. As the corner where our store front was located came to be known as an area where the Latin Disciples were hanging out, we encountered increasing resistance from the families about sending the girls to the center. After several weeks of fruitless "recruiting" efforts among the girls and their families, we decided during a staff meeting that perhaps it was wise to look for another place for getting the female part of our sample together and to consider the possibility of using the store front as a recreation center for the street gang. From our point of view this would allow us also to collect data on a gang, one of the most significant ghetto institutions of youthful peerdom.

We had had a great deal of difficulty in locating reliable information about the gangs in the neighborhood although there was a lot of information "floating around" that was in part invention and in part accurate. But one did not simply walk up to the gang members who were hanging around next door and start interviewing them in an attempt to get information. They were very circumspect about any kind of information-seeking behavior from outsiders. Consequently, we decided to explore the suggestion of one of the members that perhaps they could use the center of the storefront as their gang center. For us, it was a kind of trade of the center for their recreation purposes in exchange for access to them for information.

But our responsibilities in the trade-off came to loom larger than anticipated, including the provision of a responsible supervisor. One thing that was clear from our contact with the boys in the basement was that things had gotten to a pretty bad state in terms of noise, drinking, drugs, because the activities were never responsibly controlled. They were using the basement of the mother of one of the members, but after a few boisterous parties including some that broke up some of her furniture, she threw them out. This suggested that we could not simply turn over use of the storefront center and hope that things would last for any length of time. Understandably, the landlord who was renting the storefront to us would not allow that. He refused to allow the Disciples to use the storefront without some kind of provision for formal supervision.

The initial plan that we finally came up with was that the bilingual male field researcher, who at that time was Luis Salces, a Cuban sociologist would supervise the Center, Since he was also doing field interviewing and was continuing to do that during the following year we needed some assistant recreational leaders. It was logical and a very interesting kind of venture to hire the gang leader and his key lieutenant as recreation leaders for the group, although taking advantage of this natural state of things was the only wise thing to do. And it proved an extremely wise choice as the year went on. While the venture started as mainly a data gathering device, we began to see it as a potential mini-demonstration program. However the demonstration program was to be exploratory, in the sense that the supervisor, and at that time we hoped the two gang leaders, would describe the natural course of events that took place in the life of the gang, and in that the supervisor would, in the role of participant-observer, respond to the events that had to do with the key things that we were interested in: education, educational problems, occupation, and occupational disabilities. He was to be highly alert to and responsive to events that pertained in any way to those subjects or topics, or that related the gang to them. There evolved from the initial state of supervisor's role, a very complex multiple role, a key feature of which was what might be called cultural brokerage or subcultural brokerage. He assisted gang members in the adaptation of the Puerto Rican subculture, as it was represented in the gang, to the conditions and forces of the surrounding social institutions and society. This in part included information; in part included know-how about locating information; know-how about the procedures to go through in order to contact people; know-how in order to venture out of the neighborhood and into, in this case "the white world," (but "the black world" was also threatening in other ways) to participate in the programs and offerings of institutions outside the barrio itself.[48]

(b) Population and Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of Puerto Rican youths, both male and female, in a Chicago school during the last week in March, 1968, during their last semester in the seventh grade. The student sample also included a comparison group of non-Puerto Rican students. Thus, the original sample of students included twenty Puerto Rican youths and ten non-Puerto Rican youths. However, by extension along the student's social network the data producing sample also included the parents or guardian, at least one parent or guardian and in several cases two parents or guardians, of the youths. Data was collected from the twenty Puerto Rican youths and their families, as well as the ten non-Puerto Rican youths and their families, during the subsequent two years. During the first year of the study the youths were attending eighth grade in an elementary school with the largest majority population of Puerto Rican youths in the city. The majority of this data-producing sample went into their first year of high school, the ninth grade, in a high school with the largest minority Puerto Rican population in the city.

The portion of the sample that consisted of the ten non-Puerto Rican youths, five boys and five girls, and by extension along their network, their parents or guardians were chosen as a comparison group to help the researchers sort out ethnic and cultural factors affecting the lives of the Puerto Ricans from the general conditions of the social environment which affected anybody who lived in that area.

The age of the youths in this sample is unusually young for an SRS research project. It is more common, of course, for SRS to deal with populations seventeen years or older. However, we discovered during exploratory investigation of the Puerto Rican population in Chicago, that critical decisions regarding life's career and work career were taking critical shape during the last two years of elementary school. Moreover, the shift from an elementary school version of formal educational institutions to a high school version of formal educational institutions seems to be a critical point of passage in the education-work career of both males and females of Spanish-speaking origin in the continental United States. It may be particularly significant in the low socio-economic sectors of the population, hereafter referred to as SES. In this connection we anticipated, and indeed found, that the Puerto Rican population was consistently overage for the school grade they were in. At the beginning of the research, the average age of the initial invited sample was: NPRs, 12 years and 7 months; CPRs, 14 years and 5 months; PRPRs, 14 years and 11 months.[49] By the end of the field work in August of 1970, the PRPRs averaged 17 years and 4 months, well within the age range of interest to SRS. Moreover, as the results indicate, over half the sample had taken steps, or had made decisions, that removed them from the formal educational ladder and into the world of work or into a position to benefit from what is now being called "non-formal education."[50] In this respect then, the research is relevant to SRS interests because it delineates the processes by which a special population of Spanish-speaking youths become candidates for the rehabilitative efforts of the SRS toward better occupational adaptation.

Another interesting and important feature of the Puerto Rican population is the character of its migration pattern. Its migration pattern is quite distinctive from the dominant migration pattern of the other more populous Spanish-speaking minority in the United States, that of Mexican origin. The special migration characteristics of the Puerto Rican population require very special treatment both in terms of educational programs within the schools and in terms of non-formal training programs for portions of the population that are no longer within the egis of the organized schooling programs.

Thus, ethnicity and intercultural experience are reflected in our population. We selected a non-Puerto Rican comparison group (hereafter referred to as NPR.) In order to increase the opportunity to examine intercultural experience we stratified the Puerto Rican portion of the sample according to the amount of experience that a youth had had with continental schools. We did this by selecting half our Spanish-speaking sample from among those youths, male and female, who had at least five years of their school career in continental United States' schools. We deliberately sharply contrasted that with a short duration of intercultural experience by selecting an equal number of Puerto Rican youths, male and female, who had at least five years of their schooling experience in Puerto Rican schools. Hereafter, the first group, with five years or more experience in continental schools will be referred to as Chicago Puerto Ricans, or CPRs, and those students with at least five years of experience in Puerto Rican schools will be referred to as Puerto Rican Puerto Ricans, or as PRPRs.

In many respects the number of respondents with which we are dealing is perhaps relatively small. While the initial sample consisted of thirty youths, since parents or guardians were included, this means that the total data-producing sample was potentially at least ninety people. As a matter of fact, since we also collected observational data on peer relationships the data-producing cohort was somewhat larger than ninety people. On the other hand, since some of the parents did not accept the logic of having both the mother and the father respond to the interviews on migration history, occupational ideology, and educational ideology, the data-producing social network was somewhat smaller than ninety people.

The question of representativeness of a population by a sample in a study of this sort is a very complex one. Estimating the representativeness of a population by a sample from whom data is taken over time, is very difficult. Thus, we go into great detail regarding the nature and characteristics of the sample, specifically the data-producing sample, over the two year period during which field data were collected. In some respects we have been exceptionally and painfully candid about the erroding effects of events on the initial sample that was selected by randomized procedures. It quickly lost semblance of freedom from biases. In its erosion it may have become more representative of the population of the neighborhood. Probably the only clear way to relate complex data-producing acts, such as is characteristic of this project, to the question of how the sample represents the population, would be to set up a table showing population characteristics of the data-producing set of respondents for each of the various questionnaires and interviews. Short of this complexity, we present the composition of our data-producing youth sample at various points in the research project. This will give a much clearer picture of the sample from which data were drawn and allow better guesses about its representativeness with respect to population. In a way, our careful description underlines the fact that the rationale of sample selection and representativeness developed for studies that collect their data in very brief periods of time do not adequately cover the problem of sample selection and population representativeness in samples drawn for long-term studies. We hope the manner in which we describe our sample, and later our results will help methodologists deal with these problems of method and design. But it will underline the fact, that for a study of this sort, that estimates of representativeness of a population in a sample must be done quite often in qualitative terms rather than statistical parametric terms.

In our discussion of population and sample, we will utilize certain clarifying distinctions and definitions employed by David J. Fox, who in the early 50's conducted a study of second language teaching methods for Puerto Ricans in New York City.[51] His experience with that population, a young continental Puerto Rican population in schools, led him to spell out distinctions and perspectives in research that we find very valuable and that we will employ here in our description of our population and sample. Fox employs the concept of universe to refer to all possible respondents or measures one might had been interested in taking. Following this definition, we might think of the universe of this study as all Spanish-speaking residents of the continental United States and the host of measures that we would like to take on this population. This allows us to use the concept "population" as that portion of the universe from which the sample is selected and to which we want our generalizations to apply. With this usage then, we would describe our population in in the more narrow terms as seventh, eighth and ninth graders in and dropping out of the Chicago schools, and their parents or guardians, during the period of 1968-1970. That is, the population from which we chose our sample and from which our final "data-producing" sample was developed or left at the end of two years' research.

Fox distinguishes the sample selection process from the sample itself. We utilized random selection of our sample within stratified clusters. In order to further clarify the effects of the research project on the sample, we will follow Fox in distinguishing among the "invited sample," "accepting sample," and the "data-producing sample." The "invited sample" is the sample produced by the researcher by selecting specific elements of the population. However, the invitation to participate in a project may not always be accepted. Thus, the process of persuading individuals to participate produces a somewhat different sample. Even after initial acceptance, however, there may be further attrition during the data-producing process leading to the "data-producing" sample. The final data-producing sample may have a markedly different distribution and a very different relationship to representativeness for a set of population characteristics as well as to the non-biased base of random selection of the sample.

Over the two year period sample attrition overwhelmed efforts to maintain a close relationship between the data-producing sample and the originally selected sample, or invited sample. This can be clarified by discussing the location of our sample youths at differing points in the course of the two years of data collection.

The density of the Puerto Rican population is greater in the school in which we did our study than in any other in the city.[52] Five other schools have majority Puerto Rican populations, of the twenty-one schools in the district; The Grammar School might be representative of one third of those schools.[53] In brief, it can be taken to represent schools with majority Puerto Rican population and to a lesser degree, the experience of leaving an elementary school with a high Puerto Rican density and going to a high school with a significant minority of Puerto Rican students. However, only two high schools in the city have significant Puerto Rican minorities. Three other high schools have Puerto Rican minority student populations of 10% to 15% of the total high school population. In so far as the relative density of Puerto Ricans to the other ethnic groups significantly affects the experience of the lives of several thousands of Puerto Ricans, we are describing an experience that is relevant to over half of the Puerto Rican population in the city. And since this district contains 40% of the 24,941 Puerto Ricans in the schools, selecting this school for case studies and selecting a sample from this district seems the most reasonable choice toward finding a sample that is relevant and representative of a large portion of the experience of Puerto Ricans in the Chicago schools.

Criteria for screening the sample. Since our study was to focus on the exploration of certain problems in the Spanish-speaking population, we of course wanted to be sure our sample had a heavy representation of Puerto Ricans. But since the school population also included approximately 20% NPRs, we wanted to include some of those students in representative proportion. However, since we decided to select the Puerto Rican population in such a way as to over-represent those Puerto Ricans with heavy experience in Puerto Rican schools, we decided to select an equal number of NPRs, that is, ten NPR students. At the same time we felt that this NPR group provided a control, or better, a comparison group. The most important criterion in selecting our sample cases for a two year study was to reveal the partial factors operating in the students' relationship to the school and what happened to them with respect to school, occupational choice, and work career.

The notion of cultural antinomy and complimentarity were major research questions in the initial proposal. A completely randomly selected sample might have defeated our intention to research ethnic and acculturative differences. The sample had to be drawn as a stratified constant sample to assure us that we would be able to investigate those cultural variables we were interested in. We accomplished this by drawing half of our Puerto Rican sample from second semester seventh graders who had had five years or more of their school career in Puerto Rican schools. The other half of our Puerto Rican sample consisted of students who had spent at least five years of their school career in the continental United States schools. Thus, our sample does not reflect the distribution of CPRs and PRPRs in the school population, but is deliberately stratified to represent the extremes of experience with the cultural interface of mixed ethnic schools.

We anticipated that cultural differences of some significance between North American culture and culture of Hispanic origin might appear in standards governing male and female behavior. Our sample represented selected equal proportions of male and female components of the population for the sample. Briefly, the sample was stratified by sex and by ethnicity.

Within these groupings we decided to follow random selection procedures. This seems particularly important in view of our encounter with personnel in the Chicago schools whose attitude toward outside researchers was that the researchers selectively biased their research in the direction of the most critical and the most difficult of the student population. In other words, their general view was that we searched out a sample to reflect the biggest problems of, and seldom selected a sample to reflect the successes of, the school. Within the stratified components, we randomized our selection of the sample. In summary, our initial, or invited sample, of thirty second semester seventh graders was drawn in March 1968 and was stratified by ethnicity and sex. The ethnicity component was stratified further by years of experience with continental schools versus years of experience with Puerto Rican schools, since years of experience with Puerto Rican schools meant that the school culture was Puerto Rican-based and the instruction was received in Spanish, although English was a required subject.

With our objectives being to obtain thirty cases, equally divided among males and females, and equally divided among three cultural groups, non-Puerto Ricans (NPR), Chicago Puerto Ricans (CPR), and Puerto Rican Puerto Ricans (PRPR), we used the following procedures to pick our sample. The class cards that corresponded with the class roster for each of five seventh-grade classes were obtained and sorted into the following categories: NPR, CPR, and PRPR. These procedures left a fourth group consisting of those Puerto Ricans with intermediate experience in either Chicago schools or Puerto Rican schools, which we put aside. Each set of these groups were further divided into male and female sets. Thus, NPRs were divided into male and female, CPRs were divided into male and female, and PRPRs were divided into male and female. Then the cards were alphabetized within each group. Then within each set of cards following a table of random numbers five students were selected.

At the end of the project random selection of a sample seems almost absurd from the point fo view of all that has happened to the initial invited sample during the two and one-half years between March 1968 and August 1970. We selected the sample several months prior to the beginning of the 1968-69 school year because we wanted to establish what the accepting sample of youth and families would be. Frankly, with this population, one of the critical problems was locating the residence. While some were very easy to locate, at least 50% of the sample turned out to have inaccurate addresses on their school cards. Moreover, having located the families at one address, the high residential mobility of the neighborhood often involved us in a new search for the families even during the school year in 1970. Indeed, no sooner had we selected the sample than the process of people's moving out of the neighborhood began to erode its non-biased character. By the beginning of our research in August of

1968 we already had experienced one school dropout from our sample, one moving to the suburbs and one moving to Puerto Rico. We made great effort to manitain contacts with dropouts. But this kind of attrition to the sample was to continue throughout the two years. Once we had established relationships with the family, a youth's leaving school did not always mean we lost the individual from the data-producing sample. Moreover, refusal from youngsters in some cases did not mean that we lost contact with the family. Consequently the final data-producing sample presents a very complicated picture. (See Table 13.)[54]

In order to prepare ourselves for the kind of attrition that occurred, we would have needed not only a thirty student working sample, but also a sixty student back-up sample in order to have assured replacement in all of our categories. The very mobility of our population constantly ate away at our efforts to collect the same data from all members of our sample. Yet what happened to our sample gives others an excellent picture of the realities of the ecology of the environment in which our sample lived. It suggests the serious flaw in any type of educational program that is based on the presumption of a relatively stable residential style of life. In a sense, the process of erosion of our sample was itself an object of study in this project.

In order to begin our work with an established group of accepting students and parents, we began to observe the students in classrooms, get acquainted with them, to locate their homes (school addresses turned out to be incredibly outdated), to contact parents and to establish whether or not they were to accept our invitation to participate. This proved to be far more difficult than we thought. Refusals, it turned out, could occur at any time during the course of the several hours of interviewing we planned to do over a period of months. Persistence in one or two instances led to very hostile reaction, one interviewer was threatened with legal action, or that failing, a gun, on her second attempt to persuade a father to participate. By fall of 1968 the sample had changed. (see Table 13-2.)

Table 13-1 presents the distribution of the stratified sample of thirty youths drawn in March, 1968. It shows the original sample and its distribution into high, medium, and low reading groups. All the grades in the school had several classrooms. The eighth grade had six classrooms, including a special class of mixed seventh and eighth graders who were defined as underachievers. One can see the distribution of the sample in accord with the hierarchical ordering and homogeneous grouping of the school. Table 13-2 reveals the distribution of our sample by October, 1968, when we officially began the research with SRS' support. By that time we already had the experience of one family having moved, another student having dropped out, and two having returned to Puerto Rico. We did not lose contact with the family of the dropout in this case, however; we were able to collect questionnaire information from him. The dropout himself, however, seemed very reluctant to cooperate in the further collection of data during 1968-69, but was included in the follow-up interviews.

June of 1969 ended the school year of observation and data collection from the student sample inside the school. But we already had experienced much attrition from our sample. We attempted to maintain contact with one family that had moved. Another family moved away and returned, and that student is retained in the sample described as still in school District X. This movement illustrates the high mobility of the population in the neighborhood.

It was our experience that the Puerto Rican population was no more mobile than the non-Puerto Rican population, if one takes account of data on residential mobility during the early stages of a family's arrival in the neighborhood. The non-Puerto Rican part of the population may display more movement to other parts of the city, particularly suburban areas.

By June, 1969 our in-school sample had dropped to eighteen. (See Table 13-3.) Three out of thirty had moved to other parts of the city. We were only able to maintain contact with one of the three. Three youths had returned to Puerto Rico. Thus, eight out of thirty had left the neighborhood and indeed, the Division Street area generally. Two more had definitely dropped out of school although we attempted to retain some contact with them. But we lost contact with the girl who married and moved to Blue Island and began to work. It was clear that three families that had accepted our initial contacts were simply not going to cooperate with the project. They became definite refusals. Establishing that they were definite refusals often took several visits. In one case this was not a matter of direct refusal, but a matter of making appointments, but finding no one at home. We finally decided it was a refusal. Another case involved ready acceptance initially and then later indicated they did not want to cooperate because the questions were too personal.[55]

By June, 1970 the data-producing sample had taken its final shape. By now we had four NPRs, five CPRs, and two PRPRs left in regular school status of some sort. That totaled twelve of our original thirty. Thus, eighteen, or two thirds of our sample had either left the neighborhood or left school or refused. Four families, or 13% were refusals, 13% had returned to Puerto Rico, approximately 17% had moved to other areas of the city (including one dropout), and we were unable to maintain contact. And approximately 23% of the sample had dropped out of school. Perhaps more with whom we had lost contact had dropped out. We had good luck, however, to be able to secure information from a number of the dropouts and had data on the reaction of the family during the period when the youngsters were in the process of dropping out of school.

We were able to collect interview data from five NPR families, six CPR families, and six PRPR families. We were able to do nine NPR interviews on migration before the moves to the suburbs. Refusals reduced the size of our sample to five.

The data for teachers was based on interviews with the seven eighth grade teachers of the principal sample. In addition, we had extensive field data and additional data from interviews with seventh grade teachers and one high school counselor.

(c) Dependent and Independent Variables and Hypotheses

The purpose of the project was to identify and study through use of anthropological field techniques the origins of occupational disability in the school-to-home-to-peerdom relationships of a sample of Puerto Rican youth. Two working hypotheses were formulated in the early stages of the research that were further refined as the research progressed.[56]

> Hypothesis 1: The more acculturated the Puerto Rican student's household adults, the fewer academic school problems will that student have.
>
> Hypothesis 2: The less complementary the youth's household culture patterns and the school's culture patterns, the more important will be the youth's peers as a reference group for his behavior, including school performance and occupational expectations.

During the first year of the project we focused observations and data collection on educational problems that seemed to be culturally based. But during that year, it became clear that we needed more information on the youths' occupational orientation and the occupational orientation, or ideology, of their parents and teachers. Thus, we began to distinguish between educational ideology and occupational ideology, and to group data-eliciting questions under these two headings. Events that were observed during participant observation and described in field notes were also categorized in this way when events contained data relevant to the two domains or the relationships among them.

In the analysis of this data, we shifted away from the examination of cultural contrariety per se, and focused the analysis on the problem of how youths come to encounter and cope with access to and exclusion from certain occupational opportunities as the conditions of the environment limit and facilitate occupational orientation and aspirations.

A key independent variable in the analysis of the data from questionnaires and interviews was the ethnicity of the respondent. The data from the youth sample and their parents or guardians were analyzed by ethnicity: non-Puerto Rican and Puerto Rican. But the sample had been selected in terms of length of tenure of the Puerto Ricans in Chicago, based on youth's having five years of Puerto Rican school culture, versus having five years of North American school culture. So that the Puerto Ricans ~~were further~~ subdivided in terms of long-term residence and more recent arrivals. This allowed us to test for three postulated degrees of acculturation based on culture of origin and tenure of residence: North American, long-resident Puerto Rican, short-resident Puerto Rican.

All the data and other variables were analyzed as dependent variables, with ethnicity-residence-tenure as independent variables.

Since there was heavy attrition of the sample, (along with the serious problem of hiring qualified bilingual-bicultural personnel that in turn seriously hampered efforts to replace sample losses), the final number of respondents was quite small. Thus, the data were analyzed by percentage of frequency distribution. The data were originally separately analyzed by sex, since three values of ethnicity by two values of sex creates such small frequencies and empty cells. But the analysis by sex wiped out ethnic differences in which interesting sex differences seemed often to be contingent. Thus, sex differences are noted only when they proved to be numerically significant. This descriptive analysis is discussed in terms of educational and occupational ideology of youths, parents, and teachers. Conceptually significant, rather than simply numerically significant, contrasts and convergencies are noted.

The data from the street gang are discussed in qualitative ethnographic form, with numerical counts noted where data could be construed into measurable form.

(d) Data Collection and Analysis

Staff. The staff of the project was divided into two major groupings: a field staff and data coordinating-and-analysis staff. With the exception of two part-time field interviewers who collected data from the non-Puerto Rican part of the data-producing sample, all research assistants, graduate assistants, and educational specialists spoke both Spanish and English fluently. The division into data collecting and data processing staff was not an absolute division. On several occasions the data processing staff, members of which were located in Urbana, south of Chicago, were sent to Chicago to collect certain specific pieces of data, and to learn first hand what the field staff had to contend with in collecting data. Full staff meetings were held in Urbana at regular intervals to acquaint the field staff with problems of coordination and coverage and with data processing and analysis procedures.

Ideally, the field staff would have consisted of one male and one female, both fluently bilingual from Hispanic cultural background, preferably Puerto Rican, with at least a Master's degree in Anthropology, Applied Anthropology, or Sociology, and with one summer's supervised field work experience. For a number of reasons it proved impossible to find full-time field workers with these qualifications. The research was done during a period of a record low in unemployment and a record high of employment, and during a period when "Great Society" programs for minorities had created great demand for "ethnic" professionals to work in ghetto areas. Hispanic ethnics with college degrees were understandably drawn to higher educational programs moving them toward advanced degrees, supported by Federally funded fellowships. The draft further limited the youthful energy and willingness to work long hours in the streets of a Chicago poverty stricken neighborhood, were primary qualifications as well, recruiting qualified assistants proved to be impossible. Thus, the project director also had to train the field staff in interviewing, participant observations, and composing ethnographic descriptions in the form of field notes. Fortunately the first field worker, a young North American married to a Cuban who was very fluent in Spanish, easily established rapport with the principal sample youths. By April of 1969 we finally were able to hire our full-time male field worker, a young Cuban sociologist. In mid-May he received notice that he had been drafted into the army. Our request for occupational deferment was refused, and by July we were once again plumbing the job market. By September, we sacrificed the male feature of our job requirement, hoping to utilize the services of our storefront para-professionals when maleness was primary to success. We hired a young Puerto Rican woman to replace him.

Field Staff, Chicago

Director: Bilingual; experienced with anthropological research in Puerto Rico on adolescents, and with adolescents in North American schools.

Field Interviewers and Observers:

Full-time

One bilingual North American, female, B.A. in Spanish, married to Cuban.

One bilingual male Hispanic ethnic, Cuban. (Drafted in 1969).

One bilingual Puerto Rican female, B.A. in Economics, minor in Sociology (to replace Cuban).

Part-time

Two North American females (one a Polish ethnic); One with an undergraduate degree in Anthropology, the other a B.A. in Education.

Staff Storefront Center, Chicago

Recreation Supervisor
Bilingual North American, B.A. in Political Science.

Para-Professionals
Bilingual Puerto Rican, freshman at University of Illinois, Chicago Campus, President of Latin Disciples.

Bilingual Puerto Rican, (high school drop-out), Vice President of Latin Disciples.

Data-Processing Staff, Urbana

Bilingual Secretary (Bolivian)

Half-time

One bilingual male graduate assistant, Ph.D. candidate in Comparative Education and Applied Anthropology.

One bilingual male graduate assistant, Ph.D. candidate in School Administration and specialist in computer programming.

Hourly workers were hired as needed to help with various phases of the project.

Data collection. Data for the project were collected by participant observation and ethnographic description; with scheduled interviews, and with questionnaires. We also used a self-esteem questionnaire in association with the questionnaires.

The procedures followed in the methodology of participant observation and ethnographic description are described in detail in Volume II, Part 2 of this report. However, the use of social networks to locate data-producing respondents should be clarified. Our data producing group began with a stratified constant sample of youths in the last semester of the seventh grade. We selected additional data-contributing informants from the social networks of the original sample, specifically their eighth grade teachers, their household parents or guardians, the peers in the eighth grade, and their household siblings. Through the use of the storefront center we set out to obtain data from their friendship peers. But as we explain at length in the next section, many problems arose in this connection.

During the second year of the project, additional data were collected from a local street gang, a special form of peer relations necessary to understand the peer world of both boys and girls, but particularly of boys in the neighborhood.

Questionnaires and Interview Schedules

Part I: Contact forms. Section 1. Student Contact Card	Used for principal student sample until residential address was verified. Used also for youths entering the storefront center during 1968-69.
Part I: Contact forms. Section 2. Household Census	Used on first contact with all principal sample families of student sample.
Part II: Teacher Interview Schedule. Section 1. Background	Used for initial interview with teachers to record background data and to provide topics for discussion.
Part II: Teacher Interview Schedule. Section 2. General Information	Used for extended interviews with teachers of principal student sample.
Part III: General Student Questionnaire. Section 0. Social Network	Used to verify general information on principal sample's observed social network, and to relate sample to network of friendship choices in eighth grade.

Part III: General Student Questionnaire. Section 1. Section 2. Section 3. Section 4. Section 5.	Used to collect information on culture coding of social relationships, educational ideology, and occupational ideology. Sections merely represent an effort to break up large questionnaires into segments that could be completed in twenty to thirty minute periods.
Part IV: Parent Interview Schedule. Section 1. Migration, Residence and Adjustment. Section 2. Occupational Ideology. Section 4. Education of Children and the Formal Education system.	Used for interviews with parents of principal sample youths.
Part V: Follow-up Interview Schedule for Principal Sample. Section 1. Social Network Section 2. Re-interview of Students Section 3. Final Student Questionnaire	Used for follow-up interview with principal sample youths during spring and summer of 1970.

Language study: The language of the youths of the neighborhood was studied by a consultant to the project, Dr. Artha Sue Loy. (See Appendix B)

Regular observation and ethnographic description was done on three classrooms containing the bulk of our sample youth. A limited number of observations with ethnographic descriptions were made on all other eighth grade calsses. Participant observations and ethnographic descriptions were done of events in the sample youths' households, in addition to the interviews, when the occasions offered themselves. Other ethnographic events were done on school outings, incidents in the neighborhood, excursions from the neighborhood in which a project staff member was involved.

Long interviews were done with all the eighth grade teachers (seven) of the principal sample. Long interviews were done with household parents or guardians, often with both the mother and father of the students in the sample. (See Part IV of the interview schedules.) In June of 1969, we administered several questionnaires to all students in attendance in all the eighth grade classes. In most cases, we used the questionnaires as interview schedules for doing face-to-face interviews with our sample, although the field notes on ethnographic observation included information relevant to many of the questions included on the student questionnaires.

Finally, during the spring and summer of 1970, we used a modified version of the student questionnaire to interview the remaining youths in our student sample, to establish changes in their responses to school, and in their educational and occupational ideology, and to locate evidence of new loci of culture conflict or changes in those discovered during the last year of grammar school.

Data Analysis: All field notes and recorded interviews were processed through the IBM 360 computer. (See Volume II, Part 1, for a guide to the computer processing procedures.)

The BEDRES programs were designed to handle alphanumeric data (either prose or verse) through "effective crosslisting" of all the data input.[57] Any sentence in the data set can be located by calling any of the words the sentence contains. Thus, all the sentences containing any given word can be located by reference to that word.

Effective crosslisting is accomplished through establishing indices for the data set (cf. LEXIC0N). This permits the construction of concordances (cf. C0NC0RD) for all key words.

LEXIC0N III is a program which (1) identifies each unique word in a given corpus,[58] (2) which notes the number of occurrences of each unique word, (3) which writes out (both on paper and on magnetic tape for use with another program) an alphabetized list of the unique words and the number of times each word appeared and (4) notes the sentences in which each unique word is found.[59]

C0NC0RD I, the concordance, takes the list of unique words and the list of the sentences in which each unique word appears as determined by LEXIC0N III. It uses the information in generating concordances for any given key word or set of key words. An example follows:

> Single words. Given any single word, such as "D0G," the computer will locate all the sentences which contain the word; and print them out. The program also prints out the two sentences preceding and following the sentence containing the key word to allow the researcher to get a feeling for the context in which the word appears.

Any number of such concordances can be run with a single loading of the program.

While the staff, with training, became effective data collectors, all the inferential write-up of qualitative field data was done by the director, since the field staff did not have the theoretical training to draft sections of the report.

The data from all questionnaires and scheduled interviews were coded, and computer processed to quantify the coded responses. These data were analyzed by ethnicity with three values and by sex. The ethnicity values were:

Non-Puerto Rican (NPR)
Chicago Puerto Rican (CPR) - long term residents of Chicago selected by principal sample youth having five (5) years of school experience with continental schools.
Puerto Rican Puerto Ricans (PRPR) - short term residents of Chicago selected by youths having five (5) years of school experience with Puerto Rican schools.

Only descriptive statistical techniques were used to analyze data because of the small size of the data-producing sample for many sections of the questionnaires, when spread across the three ethnic values.

RESULTS

(a) Introduction

The results of the study will be presented in terms of four general topics. The first of these four gives background information on the migration from Puerto Rico to Chicago and the parents' reaction to the neighborhood. After noting the theme of concern over safety and security, we turn to the description of a street gang, one of the features of the neighborhood often mentioned as a source of fear. But we present the "life" of the gang from an internal perspective pointing out its important functions in the lives of youths and its relationship to the dangers so often mentioned by the parents.

The next section turns directly to the question of culture and cultural differences between home and school. But in this instance the account is not a "wholistic" account of the culture of the Puerto Rican home, but discusses our data on culture codings of specific key relationships, that operate in home settings and in school settings. This discussion relates directly to our original proposal that differences such as these would be a potential source of key conflicts between Puerto Rican students and teachers.

The third section deals with the question of differences and complementarities among the educational ideology, or belief systems, of teachers, parents, and youths. The last section focuses directly on questions of occupation and belief systems concerning occupational careers and their relationship to educational careers, ethnicity, and the opportunity structure of the lives of the youths. We examine opportunity structure mainly in terms of our concept of "resource redundancy," or "back-up" resources.

(b) Migration and the neighborhood

This report on our results might have begun with a discussion of our sample youths in school, where our research actually began. But to begin there would be like entering in the middle of a drama, a drama whose beginnings many of the CPR youths had either forgotten or never knew. But our PRPRs know it and have felt the impact of their migration from Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico, a small, mountainous, emerald green island in the Caribbean, is 100 miles in length from east to west and 35 miles in width from north to south. On this tiny expanse two and one half million people live. Another million Puerto Ricans (or children of island born Puerto Rican families) live on the mainland, in New York City, Newark, Philadelphia, Boston and

Chicago. Given this population density in a developing economy the reasons people would leave seem self-evident. But we asked they why, anyway, along with many other questions about their departure and their arrival.

Migration. There is a rather wide spread belief that immigrants from Puerto Rico come mainly from rural areas. In only about 38.5% of our Puerto Rican families did the parents or household head come from rural areas.[60] (See Ques. 7.0.0, Table 7) One family was brought from a rural area by a single female who married (in this case established a consensual marriage) a town-dwelling Puerto Rican male immigrant after she arrived. (We counted this family as rural in origin.) The rest came from towns and small cities. Another general belief about Puerto Rican immigrants that our data do not confirm is that they are rural migrants to Puerto Rico's metropolitan areas, particularly to San Juan. They then migrate to the mainland in a second stage of a migrating pattern. This migratory course is not characteristic of our sample. (See Ques. 10.1.0, Table 7) Only one household head migrated to a metropolitan area, Ponce, before moving on to the mainland and Chicago.

Actually, C. Wright Mills found the same thing to be true of the Puerto Ricans in New York whom he studied in 1947. As he puts the point:

> "Generally, their urban residence on [sic in] Puerto Rico was not a step in a journey from country to city to overseas voyage. In the main, they always lived in cities; only about one out of five can be considered rural in origin. The rest have merely changed the size and complexity of the city in which they live."[61]

Oscar Lewis's sample of fifty New York City-dwelling Puerto Rican families was selected by "referral" from San Juan slum relatives. He states that for his sample "the trip to New York was generally made in two stages: from rural Puerto Rico to San Juan and then to New York City."[62] Perhaps in part the difference in conclusion is due to the nature of Puerto Rican towns. Though their dense populations lead to their being classified by census categories as cities, they generally are townlike in social character. The main point is that Puerto Rican immigrants tend to have been town dwellers before they came to the mainland. They may indeed have come from the poorer sections of those towns. We will argue that our group is unlike the Lewis sample, for their journey to the mainland was not the second stage of a two stage migration pattern. Indeed the move to the mainland was the first change in locale of residence for slightly over 80% of the whole Puerto Rican adult sample.[63]

The pull of the chance for economic improvement is a major, if not the major contributing condition to encouraging Puerto Ricans to make the journey to the mainland, although a miscellany of personal reasons and events may precipitate the immediate decision to make the trip. (See Ques. 12.0.0, Table 7) In some respects the mainland seems to serve the common man of Puerto Rico as the Western frontier served for the common man of the mainland until the early years of this century. It presents an alternative to the present, although perhaps fantasized or exaggerated in its economic opportunities. Most of our sample talked of the economic opportunity or "opportunities" they thought the mainland would offer. (See Ques. 21.1.0, Table 7) In several cases we learned of personal problems or crises that encouraged them to seriously consider a move to the mainland, but the promise if not the reality, of opportunity was apparently an underlying, persistently present, and relatively easily accomplished condition in their lives. Moreover, it was easy, to reverse themselves, to turn around and go home, if things did not work out as well as had been expected.

Friends and family members provided our Puerto Rican sample with information about Chicago. (See Ques. 21.0, Table 7) Only one Puerto Rican respondent mentioned an agency helped him find out about Chicago. Two of the non-Puerto Rican sample mentioned an agency, and equal numbers mentioned family and friends. But the Puerto Ricans' responses to the interview question suggested that stories and accounts of the mainland are common fare for conversation in Puerto Rico. With one exception the more recent arrivals among the Puerto Ricans recalled having heard about the job opportunities and the money paid for jobs in Chicago. The longer-resident Puerto Ricans, (CPRs) were about equally divided between recalling economic information they knew about Chicago, and recalling other things such as about the weather, better housing, or even a place with better opportunity for their children. This information about their childrens' opportunities was not mentioned at all by the recent arrivals, i.e., the families of the Puerto Rican educated. But the opportunities for education have improved greatly in the last fifteen to twenty years in Puerto Rico itself and our adults in the families of our Chicago educated Puerto Rican sample, with one exception, have lived in Chicago for fifteen years or more.

The recent Puerto Rican arrivals reported knowing negative things about Chicago, usually about crime and degeneracy. So their view of the mainland is not all dreamy fantasies. (See Ques. 21.1, Table 7) Among the CPRs, only one person recalled knowing about crime and related conditions before arriving in Chicago. Their recall of negative information concerns the weather or no negative information at all.

The non-Puerto Rican migrants with one exception, report that they had heard nothing about Chicago before they departed for the U.S., suggesting that overseas immigrants made their decision to come after arrival in the States. One of the intra-migrating respondents said he had heard good paying jobs were available in Chicago. Nevertheless, the general lack of advance information about Chicago among the NPRs is surprising. But the greater frequency at which Puerto Ricans report advance information supports the proposition that information about the economic "opportunities" on the mainland is a pervasive feature of life, in Puerto Rico, at least among certain segments of the population.

Just what they expected to find in Chicago, reflects the basic reasons for coming. The recent arrivals among the Puerto Ricans emphasized that they expected to find "better opportunities" and more than one-half of those specifically state they expected better economic opportunity.(See Ques. 21.0.0, Table 7) There was greater variation in the replies of the CPRs, although about one-half of this group still spoke of expecting better opportunities.

The NPRs give a somewhat different picture. Political motivation and the expectation of a better political environment is reflected in the response of half of the immigrating NPRs. Only one female, in a family that came to Chicago from Virginia, mentioned primarily expecting economic improvement. One recent Puerto Rican immigrant and two NPR immigrants said they had no ideas, no expectations.

Their expressed expectations contribute to the picture of the differences between Puerto Rican migration and the migration of other groups to the U.S. mainland. Subsequent discussions of the immigrants' arrivals in Chicago will throw additional light on this and related perspectives.

In response to the more direct question of why they left their place of origin, three characteristics stand out. (See Ques. 12.0.0, Table 7) For Puerto Ricans, economic factors are mentioned by everyone, although over half of the respondents included personal reasons of some sort for coming. The women often report they came because their husbands had already come to the mainland. The general response mejor ambiente from the Puerto Ricans was the way the question was answered initially. Gentle probing usually revealed economic expectations, often mixed with some personal, precipitating development. The personal reasons might be given in several ways. "I came for adventure," aventura; "I came to earn money for my daughter's wedding;" "I came for a vacation."

The two NPR respondents who migrated within the borders of the U.S. also mention economic reasons, although perhaps personal reasons motivated them also. But those migrants who crossed a national political boundary, emphasize not economic reasons for leaving the place of origin, but political reasons.

Conceptualizing the situation in terms of "pull" and "push" factors we would suggest that there is in Puerto Rico a pervasive "pull" of economic character toward going to the United States particularly among the unskilled, semi-skilled, and small business proprietors, all of whom could use a "stake" to move themselves upward in economic status in Puerto Rico--this often includes enough money to buy land to build a house or just to build a house; and money to buy a farm or a business to get them on their feet, or back on their feet again. So the pull to the States is complemented by the push of economic strains or stress in Puerto Rico.

There is counter pull however--the strong ties to family and friends. Most of these older Puerto Rican adults show deep affection for and deep sentiments of loyalty to Puerto Rico, perhaps to the point of dreamy fantasies of life when negative memories have gradually been forgotten. This hold of "mi patria" is altered by personal crisis. Some painful trouble develops in the family or with a friend that threatens complications of personal confrontations, loss of status through damaging the family's reputation in the community or perhaps confrontation with authorities of one sort or other. Even if of short duration, these developments reduce temporarily at least the counter to the pull of "opportunities" in the States. If the economic and occupational situation of the individual is good, the pull and push do not affect him. But for those who are economically marginal or experience economic misfortunes the play of pull, counter-pull, and push are present.

Only one person in our sample reported coming to the mainland when he had a good job in Puerto Rico. He reported coming for a vacation, but staying because the pay for the same work was much better on the mainland. So our proposition concerning push and pull forces fits the adult with his own family of procreation; it probably does not fit the case of unmarried youths who decide to come to the States for "aventura" or for young females, who come for greater "liberty" from the tight constriction of family and community control. The reader should recall we are talking of people who come from the small towns in the island or from county barrios; the character of push and pull forces may be very different for the residents of the metropolitan slum areas such as San Juan.

Our pull-then-push construct regrettably is neither tried nor supported by the information that over half of the Puerto

Rican respondents came as a result of "sudden" decisions to leave Puerto Rico and come to the mainland. The sequence of events does not seem to be "long planned ambition" nor first personal crisis, search for alternative, then decision to leave. (See Ques. 14.0.0, Table 7)

To add perspective to our view of the Puerto Ricans, however, let us look at the NPRs. They also make their decisions rather quickly. The single longest consideration given to coming to the U.S. was one year. The other three "political" immigrants decided suddenly and came suddenly. The two Southerners also described their decision as a short term decision. Of course, the decision to come to a specific place is somewhat different than the determination that one wants to leave some place. Regrettably we did not phrase the question in terms of the decision to leave. But the apparent conclusion we can draw from this data is that the coupling of the decision to leave with a decision about where to go is a sudden one whether the push factor is personal or political and the pull factor economic opportunity or relief from political-religious stresses.

As to returning to their place of origin the overwhelming majority of Puerto Ricans do plan to return; none of the NPR migrants plan to return to their place of origin. (See Ques. 16.0.0, Table 7) This points up a very distinctive characteristic of the Puerto Ricans--most do not intend to settle down permanently on the mainland. Moreover, the long tenured Puerto Rican residents are slightly more definite about returning permanently to Puerto Rico, than are the recent arrivals. Among the recent arrivals there was one respondent who definitely did not plan to return; another did not know, and two more spoke only of returning for vacations. But half the respondents were definite, never about a specific time for returning, but definite about the contingency conditions. This usually involved meeting some financial goal or doing so "when possible," cuando podimos. Interestingly, the long tenured residents seem more definite about returning than the recent arrivals, and none spoke of returning just for vacations. Returning was thought of in terms of permanent return; when economic goals were accomplished or when it was possible.

This special condition of the migration pattern of Puerto Ricans we contend is a fundamental factor that needs to be taken into account, but which is seldom taken into account, in designing educational and occupational training programs for Puerto Ricans. We will have much more to say about the implications of this characteristic of the Puerto Ricans later when we discuss the application of our research results.

The notion of New York City as a point of arrival from which a "diaspora" takes place is far too simple a view of the sometimes complicated routes that people followed before arriving in Chicago.[64]

About 60% of our Puerto Ricans came directly to Chicago from Puerto Rico. (See Ques. 10.1, Table 7) But most of the Puerto Ricans also not only had friends but relatives in Chicago before they arrived. Two Puerto Ricans, one man and one woman, came to Chicago via a stopover in New York. Thus only two persons' route fit the stereotype of a New York diaspora. Two others had been to and spent time in the New York and New Jersey area, but had returned home to Puerto Rico before going to Chicago. The other routes show more variety: Philadelphia, Miami, and then Chicago; Springfield, Massachusetts, home to Puerto Rico, then to Chicago; another went first to Florida, then to New Jersey, and then to Chicago, each stage interrupted with return trips to Puerto Rico.

Even the non-Puerto Ricans, both overseas and intra-national migrants followed complicated routes. One major difference, that makes the Puerto Rican routes distinctive when compared with the non-Puerto Ricans, is the great frequency with which the stages of the routes for Puerto Ricans are punctuated by return trips to Puerto Rico. Thus, again there is the reappearance of the repeated returns to place and culture of origin that probably carries with it the implication of cultural and emotional renewal for the Puerto Ricans. Even our intra-national migrant families did not show this great a frequency of return to place of origin.

The Puerto Ricans, more often than the NPRs, leave spouse and children behind, while they come alone to the mainland to establish a home. (See Ques. 26.0, Table 7) The NPRs moved along the complicated route of the journey either in family groups, or if not yet married, in the company of siblings and relatives or at least with friends. Perhaps the difference lies mainly in the fact that the Puerto Ricans had relatives or friends from their own town waiting for them. There is always someone to meet one at the air terminal.

The difference is echoed in the question of who helped them when they arrived. Approximately 70% of the earlier arrivals among the Puerto Ricans said they received no financial help to come to or to get settled in Chicago. (See Ques. 20.0, Table 7) But only 37.5% of the recent arrivals from Puerto Rico denied receiving financial help; both the intra-national NPR migrants denied receiving financial help. The Puerto Ricans who received help, particularly the recent arrivals, mention family, and sometimes friends as the source of financial help. Two CPRs mentioned receiving help from the Migration Division of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to take part in short-term agricultural jobs on the mainland. Only one recent arrival received agency assistance, and that from a state welfare agency and a city employment agency as soon as he arrived. In contrast with the recently arriving Puerto Ricans, three of the NPR families mentioned receiving financial help from private agencies, specifically ethnic agencies that help political refugees. Thus, private agencies seem to provide assistance to the **international migrants** in our sample, but Puerto Ricans must rely largely on personal relations for adaptive assistance. Most Puerto Ricans are able to move within a network of family relationships and friendship relationships in their journey to and from the mainland. Half of the recent arrivals had relatives in Chicago before they came. Over 70% had friends from the same town. (See Ques. 29.0, Table 7) Of the long-resident Puerto Ricans less than half, about 35% had relatives, but over 60% had friends here from their own town of origin. In contrast 50% of the NPRs knew nobody in Chicago. The two intra-national migrants had relatives, siblings to be specific, and one had a friend in Chicago before they arrived. Thus the familiar ties and home town friends proffers to Puerto Ricans a cushion of familiar relationships against the strange, hard realities of establishing oneself in Chicago.

Did the friends and relatives help when the Puerto Ricans arrived? In a little over 60% of the cases for Puerto Ricans, relatives and friends helped. They helped with transportation, food, clothing and getting a job. If you have relatives and/or friends, you get help from relatives; if not them, then friends. Such help may include job opportunities, housing, etc. If one knows neither relatives nor friends one fends for himself. But agency help is not a prominent feature of the conception of options on arrival in Chicago.

Relatives seem to help the new arrivals get acquainted with new friends, but relatives are less important in this regard to CPRs and NPRs. (See Ques. 33.1, Table 7) The neighbors in the same building are emphasized, by new arrivals, as persons with whom they make friends, but are less frequently mentioned by CPRs, although perhaps not significantly less. Church and chance meetings in the neighborhood are important to the CPRs. Two men from each Puerto Rican group mentioned work as a place where they made friends. Understandably more CPRs than PRPRs felt it did not take long to make friends. But compared with the 100 percent of the NPRs who said it did not take long, the Puerto Ricans clearly found it somewhat more difficult than non-Puerto Ricans to make friends in a new neighborhood.

While chance meetings are important to all the three groups, there is a different pattern of emphasis in the non-Puerto Rican group. For example, non-Puerto Ricans mention relatives as links to new friends only once. Neighbors in the building are less frequently mentioned than in the neighborhood generally, although this may be a function of the fact that more NPRs than Puerto Ricans live in a single family or extended family building. (See Ques. 33.4, Table 7) Church is not important to many as a place to meet friends, but it is among the more important places to CPRs. In sharp contrast to Puerto Ricans, NPR parents find their children to be a source of new friends. I have no ready explanation for why only 25% of the recent arrivals from Puerto Rico mention meeting friends through their children, while 60% of the NPRs said this was a means of getting acquainted in a new neighborhood. It is an intriguing contrast to keep in mind when we later focus on the youths in our principal sample rather than on their parents.

The familial-friendship network of Puerto Ricans is clearly of great assistance to those who chose to migrate. And it had great potential for assisting new arrivals to get settled without serious psychological or emotional displacement. It also means, however, that the standard agency's means of contacting and assisting new arrivals may be ineffective in contacting new Puerto Rican arrivals. Perhaps contacts can be encouraged by establishing a general reputation among the Puerto Rican community so that many relatives know the agency and will direct their kin there. This is a more diffuse, long term, and less controlled means for contacting clients than most agencies would allow.

The familial network probably easily lends itself to ethnic specialization in modes of adaptation, including development of occupational niches. But it has not been deliberately utilized for this purpose, probably due to the mistaken notion, in our view, that all ethnic occupational specialization is a dead-end street or a direct route to low wage poverty. Yet, these are the very types of agencies that most readily offered assistance to international immigrants. It need not be so, but this question will be discussed at length in the final section on interpretation and application of results.

The Neighborhood. Once having established themselves, one might like to know whether they in turn help other relatives or friends to get settled. (See Ques. 30.0a, Table7) The Puerto Ricans report helping new arrivals more frequently than non-Puerto Ricans. However, when the latter sample does help they tend to report helping more people. But Puerto Ricans tend to emphasize helping relatives, while none of the NPRs mention giving help to relatives. Indeed, among Puerto Ricans, apparently the longer one is on the mainland, the more likely one is to have helped relatives get settled by providing help with jobs or housing. Every long-resident Puerto Rican has helped someone get settled. On the other hand the recent arrivals mention helping more people than CPRs.

The attitude toward the neighborhood of the recent arrivals among the Puerto Rican is more positive than the attitude of the other two groups. (See Ques. 25.0, Table 7) About 50% are positive or neutral and 50% are negative. The longer resident CPRs are about 62.5% negative, and the NPRs are 90% negative toward the neighborhood. Two families are negative because of the presence of so many Puerto Ricans or "Spanish" as they are often called. Recent Puerto Rican arrivals appear to feel the neighborhood is as good as, or better than, other neighborhoods. Not so, most of the CPRs and the NPRs. In comparing this neighborhood with others, it is interesting that CPRs are more negative about the neighborhood than are NPRs. (See Ques. 25.0.0, Table 7) This growth of dissatisfaction, may, of course, be part of the emotional development that motivates the search for a better place to live in the suburbs, when financial circumstances seem to permit it. But freedom of choice about where to go is apparently not as open for the Puerto Ricans.

The opinion of the neighborhood compared with that of their place of origin is a different matter to the new arrivals. Fifty percent feel their Puerto Rican neighborhood was better than this one, as do the CPRs. But the latter give a slight edge to this neighborhood as being better. The general negativism of the NPRs shows up again in this comparison. Unlike the Puerto Ricans, none report it as better than their neighborhood of origin, and only two regard it as the same, including those NPRs who are not migrants but have lived in other neighborhoods. The two PRPRs who regard the neighborhood as better felt so because of jobs and receiving more money. The positive CPRs mention jobs but also better physical condition of their dwelling. The negativism of the NPRs cover a number of considerations; crime, noise, other ethnics and the school. The family that was negative about school moved from the neighborhood to the suburbs before this interview was done, for the sake of better schools.

The reasons for the negative attitudes, when elaborated, focus on gangs, problems in controlling youth, crime and danger. The Puerto Ricans tend to emphasize crime and danger more than non-Puerto Ricans. This then opens up the question of the place of gangs in the neighborhood and the view of the neighborhood from the point of view of a street gang.

The Latin Disciples. The general social structure of the Latin Disciples is very much like the social structure described in other gangs in Chicago. Thus the structure of the Vice Lords, a Black gang described by Keiser before it became a federated regional gang, had a structural form much like the Latin Disciples. The basic organizational structure was a division into senior, junior and peewee age-grades.[65] The age distribution in each of these levels is a kind of easy-going older and younger division. Some of the boys, or "guys" who were sixteen and almost all of the boys who were over sixteen were in the senior level group. The peewee group consisted of some of the guys who were sixteen and almost all of the fifteen, fourteen, and thirteen year olds. The thirteen year olds for the most part were the "incoming" Disciples. The general unincorporated group of boys that was younger than the peewees was called "little guys," and many were relatives of the older boys. There was a special relationship between the little guys and the older members of the gang, particularly the seniors, that we will describe later when we talk about the functions of the gang for the young people and youth in the neighborhood including the younger boys.

Recruitment tended to be not only via relatives but also via friendship networks. Thus the younger boys, the peewees "get their own friends to join their own club."[66] The leaders of the gang, or as they were called by the members themselves, the "main guys" consisted of a president who had been president since the gang started, and a vice-president who had been vice-president since the gang started; and war counselors consisting of three other charter members of the gang. These five comprised the main five and were regarded as the main guys. However the term "main guy" may also be applied to one of the older seniors who spends a lot of time in the center, is a participant in a lot of the decisions, and is in on a lot of the important action that takes place for the gang. Key qualities in continuing in one's role as leader of the group are a combination of "the ability to handle yourself," which refers to the fact that one is physically able to both defend oneself and be aggressive in order to counter the aggression of others; brains, or sufficient intelligence to be able to utilize other means of handling problems that arise rather than always resorting to the use of physical force. Physical force in encounters is a pervasive, dominant scene in the life of the gang, ranging all the way from pseudo-fighting to very serious street conflicts sometimes involving handling guns and other destructive weapons. But the key to a good leader was that he could seek out alternative ways of resolving conflicts and differences with other gangs without loss of their "rep." But he also had to be a good strategist in the encounters with the other gangs so that he did not constantly involve his gang in having to exercise their inter-gang war prowess. The following quote from the gang president about the history of the personal qualities that allowed him to continue as leader explains the required qualities: "Well, it looked to me like it was a lot physically when I was younger and then when I got older some of the guys got stronger than I but I still outsmarted them somehow, so they said okay." He goes on to say "I always try to use my brains rather than strength; I always try to talk my way out of something. Unless I'm really riled up, then I use my strength."[67]

In addition to main guys who have rather central positions in the organization, there was a set of guys known as "respected guys." This included all the main guys, but in addition some other members of the gang who were respected because of certain special characteristics including perhaps the quality of being cheerful or being able to think up interesting things to do, being able to play pool or ping pong well, and being very good at the various kinds of sports activities that are the mainstay of the day-to-day life of the gang. A further aspect of the organization is the fact that members, particularly the main guys, were very close to one another personally and were said to be "like brothers" to each other, brothers who would defend each other, "not only if necessary, but even if not necessary."

There was a kind of initiation, a rite of passage for entry. It was not highly elaborated but all had to go through a boxing match to show their courage and strength and ability, even if they did not win the boxing match, before they were finally incorporated into the group. Prior to that there was some general discussion about whether people liked the guy including a discussion with the more respected senior members of the gang.[68]

The significance of sports in the gang's life is reflected in some measure by the fact that the gang started as a baseball team. They were doing very well, too. Their baseball team included a Polish boy. At that time there was an older boys' team around called the "Disciples" and the president of the Latin Disciples reported they liked that name. Thus they asked the older boys if they could use it and were told "yes," if they called themselves the Junior Disciples. After the baseball season was over they decided to start going to the dances and become a group admired by others, to become the kind of people who were invited to the dances. Thus while they began as a baseball team, apparently around the time they were in the seventh grade or going into the eighth grade, the next year they began to expand into something that was more than just a group. It was then that they started having the gang fights, their first gang fight being with some older boys called the San Francisco Boys. This particular encounter, their first fight, included being shot at. But they went on getting more organized and getting to be a larger and larger club until they reached a point at which they had two sections. One section had about sixty members and the other section, located several blocks away, had about seventy members.

The president described 1967 as a time when Puerto Ricans were not so much fighting other Puerto Rican gangs but when Puerto Ricans were fighting Poles. They apparently formed an alliance in these encounters with the Spanish Lords. Then, beginning in 1968 they started having trouble with the Latin Kings, a contiguous Puerto Rican gang that also had many members at The Grammar School. The competition with the Latin Kings came about because the Latin Kings decided that the Disciples were getting too big and had become a threat to them. The fights often developed not on the street but at dances and they often involved encounters with police.

A great calamity struck the gang in 1968 at a large dance they had sponsored in order to make money. Sponsoring a dance was one of the key ways in which the group made money to support their activities. On that fateful winter night there were other gang members attending the dance, since one of the objectives of giving a dance was to collect as much money as possible from as many as possible. A fight broke out between some Latin Kings and boys from another gang. A Latin King was shot and as the assailants were rushing from the dance hall they encountered one of the Latin Disciples coming upstairs from the basement where he was getting ice. One of the Disciples who witnessed the event said apparently the assailants thought that he was going to try to stop them and so shot him, very near the heart. He died that night. This incident so depressed the gang and so shook the confidence of the leader in his ability to lead (in some ways he seemed to blame himself and his own decisions for having brought it about) that the gang for a time lost its organizational verve and viability. This meant it lost membership and thus might well have gone out of existence.

The interview from which most of this material is taken was done in the summer of 1969. The events being described took place in November of 1968. Thus it appears that we encountered the gang when its organizational spirit was at a low ebb. While the two sections still seemed to exist, the most active membership was located in section A that started hanging out next to the project storefront center.

The association with the Black Disciples on the south side was apparently highly tenuous if it existed at all. The Latin Disciples were aware of them and they were also aware of their well publicized political activities.

The number of Disciples is an apparently always approximated number; so far as we know there is no membership list and counting the members was always a matter of starting to call off the names. But the combination of the participant observation throughout the year and the interviews that were done led us to count approximately fifty-eight boys who were sufficiently participant in the group to be called members. However, membership was marked by a brief initiation of boxing with boxing gloves. Thus checking how many of the members of that fifty-eight were absolutely official members, that is had gone through that process was almost a problem in indeterminant knowledge. As a matter of fact we were not the only ones who suffered from this problem of knowing who were formally members and who were not. At times disputes arose about formal membership. A member might accuse another boy who was in the center and using its facilities of not being a member. And if no one could really argue that that was the case, then they would go through the boxing bout again to confirm membership. There were however, approximately thirty to forty consistently active and well-recognized members.

The ethnicity of the gang was both Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish-speaking. One of the important conceptual areas in the cognitive life of the gang was ethnicity. Their categorizations were in the main three: White; Puerto Rican; and Black. The White-Puerto Rican boundary was one that separated non-Spanish-speaking from the Spanish-speaking. Thus Puerto Ricans included all of those who were themselves from or had parents who were from countries of Hispanic tradition and of Spanish language. That group then included the several Mexican and Cuban members of the gang. The Whites were those who did not speak Spanish. It is likely that a non-Hispanic member who had developed a great facility in speaking Spanish gradually would have been regarded as Puerto Rican. Blacks of course were also non-Spanish-speaking and were referred to as Black. There were no black members at the time that we began our contact with the Disciples, although during the year a Black did come to the group requesting membership. He was considered, but there was some suspicion about his motives for asking to join, precisely the kind of thing that would have eliminated any person who had asked to join. He obviously, however, could handle himself at the pool table and was able to handle himself physically.

In terms of language, as well as membership, the gang was bilingual and bicultural although Puerto Rican culture dominated the gang. A Cuban field researcher observed that even the Cuban members were very Puerto Rican in their dress and their demeanor and in the way they spoke Spanish.

There were no regular female members but there were girls associated with the boys, and in several different ways. There were some girls who came around and it was said of an earlier era when the gang occupied a basement and was giving a number of parties that a group of girls hung around. And they called themselves the Disciplettes. During the period of our observation there was a group of about three or four girls that came by with some regularity and went out with the boys but their connection with the gang members was not in any way formal. A second set of girls were relatives of some of the boys who came by regularly and because of some special conditional arrangement in their families were allowed to come to the center and associate with the boys. In addition there were a few girls who were novias, girlfriends, but in the more serious, Puerto Rican sense who did come by when their boyfriends were there. However, most of the boys carefully kept their novias away from the center, simply to keep down the conflicts between themselves and the other boys whom they felt did not treat the girls with respect. Thus there was always an interest in having girls around but the girls in the boys' lives who were important to them were not allowed to hang around the center. This simply duplicates in the attitudes of the gang members themselves the attitudes of the parents toward having their daughters near or in the center that was ordinarily used by gang members even if it were so used at different times of day.

The gang naturally functions in very important ways in the lives of these boys and young men, these youths. In its simplest terms it is a voluntary association with special characteristics, just as certain young peoples' voluntary associations in churches are different from their voluntary associations in schools. But the street gang was specially adapted to the condition of this neighborhood outside the household and outside the school, as it was particularly adapted to the ecology of life of youths in this neighborhood in the streets.

One of the most pervasive emotions among all the people in this area is the emotion of fear or a sense of lack of physical security. One simply must be very careful because he will be set upon, robbed, beaten, and exploited; so in that respect it is dangerous. This danger is recognized by the schools which exercise great care in controlling the entry from the outside. It is recognized in the homes and apartments through the large locks that are used on the doors, the great care with which knocks on the door are greeted or not greeted, and the general caution of people about being out on the street, particularly after dark or when general danger is threatened. From the point of view of the people in the households and from the perspective of the people in the schools, and certainly from the point of view of the Whites in the household, the gang itself was part of the thing they fear. And indeed it might be said at a certain point the gang could be instrumental or a factor in driving Whites out of the neighborhood. However, from inside the gang one also sees the condition of fear, but sees the gang as a kind of security guard on which not only members can call, but relatives and even friends of the gang members can call. One of the pervasive characteristics of the gang was their physical prowess and their physical activity. This ranged all the way from the mock fighting and wrestling that went on in the center to the most serious gang encounters that included lethal weapons and at times guns, when the encounter was regarded as particularly dangerous and when there was reason to believe that the opposing gang or group carried guns and would use them.

Rules of the gang were enforced through physical means if the individual who legitimately might have followed orders was reluctant. Legitimizing following orders was in part a matter of physical dominance. Thus the project supervisor, who was not a member of the gang, as well as the gang leaders, had to be able to enforce demands they made once they decided that certain rules were to be followed, demands were to be met, or orders were to be executed.

Another key need that the gang provided was the organization of activities. The age period of youths that we are dealing with, ranging from thirteen to nineteen or twenty years of age, is a period when recreational activities and entertainment are very important in the lives of the young people. The extracurricular activities of the school and other organizations such as church groups engaged some young people in the neighborhood, but they reached a very limited part of the youth population because many of the youths in the neighborhood were not members of the sponsoring organization. That is not to suggest that gang members do not participate in the extracurricular activities of the high school when they are interested and qualified to do so; they did. Indeed, ROTC, along with its various activities, was a very attractive high school activity for many members of the gang. Sports in high school were very important to many members of the gang. But it should be remembered that many of the extracurricular activities in high schools have a grade achievement qualification and while the members of the gang ranged all the way from complete failures to highly successful students, the proportion of the gang members who were able scholars was very limited. Thus, out of a gang of thirty-five, perhaps no more than ten were sufficiently strong academically to qualify for many of the extracurricular activities in the high school. On the other hand, there was a general attitude that perhaps one of the few reasons to go to school with any enthusiasm was because of the extracurricular activities that were there. The gang leader stayed in school and said extracurricular activities made it tolerable. He said, "But while going to school most of the guys don't work. Let's say, maybe, one out of three works, not all of them. They always like to be in school, because there are more activities in school to join up with." That figure should be recognized as reflecting one-third of those who are in school. However, the same leader goes on to say, "...most of the guys right now have either quit school or are thinking of quitting school and getting a permanent job and making enough bread to get out of the house or something like that or get out of town. Most of these guys are anxious to get out of this town."

One of the realities of the relationship of the dropouts to the schools, of course, is that it fluctuated. We observed the process of becoming a dropout, re-entering, and again becoming a dropout two or three times during the year for a number of the gang members. Thus the activities of the gang were critical and important for the boys. This is particularly so during the summer. In addition to sports such as football, softball, and baseball, including participation in a baseball league, the gang offered access to dances, organized campings and outings and organized wrestling.

Drugs and the use of alcohol were also part of the life of this neighborhood in the streets. And the boys used them. Their attitudes toward them were not completely open, however. Alcohol, marijuana, and some pills were regarded as all right. There was a general dread of the use of heroin. There was a very strong negative feeling on the part of some of the main guys toward glue-sniffing. LSD was regarded as a kind of crazy embodiment. Beer was the main source of alcohol partly because of cost. Marijuana, however, was regarded as the "king" of the means to highs. And so it was being used by the Disciples as much as it was on college campuses and in many high schools in 1969 and 1970. When one was on a high, the streets were extremely dangerous. The parents of almost all the youths were strongly opposed to their taking drugs or drinking heavily and consequently did not provide much of a haven while a youth was on a high. And there were often severe consequences administered by parents after they revived. Consequently the gang and its members was a place where one could recover with some protection. That is precisely what the gang offered. That did not mean that after glue-sniffing one got very kindly treatment. It also did not mean that he was free of jibes and cutting remarks that related to the use of certain drugs. But the gang was a recovery haven. Moreover, the gang probably served as a site for socialization into the use of alcohol and drugs, but might well also be regarded as a setting in which there was not only knowledge about the use of drugs but some knowledgeable attitudes about limits on usage.

The other way in which the group served was frankly as a small-change resource to poor young people for things like hamburgers, beers, and cigarettes. That is, it was a kind of commune that pooled resources. There was no central pooling, but if one member had sufficient funds to buy cigarettes, beer, or other small-change goodies, or had picked them up through petty theft, these were shared with the other members of the group.

In connection with this, there was another important economic resource. This related also to another part of the ecology of the neighborhood that we dealt with under discussion of contacts with the police. Its economic side was bail. One probably thinks of threats coming mainly from the street in this neighborhood, but another serious threat in the life of these young people was the police. From their point of view, they were constantly being raided by the police. They were being stopped, being picked up, being taken to the police station, kept over night, and exposed to the macabre life of city jails. Thus, the gang was a critical resource with respect to bail problems. One of the alarms to which the members responded the quickest was word that someone had been picked up by the police. They immediately attempted to locate him and often brought resources to him through legal counsel provided by the local YMCA. They alerted and supported the family if the family were attempting to get the individual out of jail. If the family could not cover the cost of bail, they helped collect the money to do so.

Contact with the police and arrest were regular and constant parts of daily life as it was viewed from the Center. Thus word drifted in over and over again that someone had been picked up for causes ranging from truancy (which was a rather frequent charge) through some more serious accusations of robbery and extortion. Thus, if a young boy were picked up for the first time by the police, the gang sounded the alarm and was the major resource of coping information. That is, they knew how to get him out and provide him with the know-how of negotiating and dealing with the police, with securing counsel, with attempting to get the charges dropped.

But looking at the whole process from the point of view from the gang, our feeling was that serious occupational disability probably developed from educational problems such as truancy because arrest and having to stay over in jail was so often a part of that violation. There is some evidence that this regular contact with police and jail through truancy is a precursor of later, more serious, delinquency involved in individuals' lives. But from our point of view and from the point of view of occupational mobility later in life, we wondered what this kind of police encounter and record would mean for many of the youths, including youths in the last years of high school before they were about to drop out.

Finally, and in a form of summing up, one can see the gang as a source of information, of know-how, and of socialization of dealing with many of the serious problems of the neighborhood. Beyond that, the gang was a group way of exploiting the environmental resources. We have mentioned several examples of the way in which the gang served as a kind of cooperative that allowed some pooling of limited resources. We have referred to the fact that it could serve as a money-earning organization from time to time in order to earn the funds to support the very important recreational activities for the young people.

However, one other respect in which gangs have come to serve very importantly in the lives of the young people is to access resources outside the neighborhood itself via relationships with certain agencies, social service agencies. In turn, they often acted as part of the political numbers that were needed by some agencies, for example such as the Spanish Action Committee, during a parade or political demonstration. The SAC asked the "D's" for just such support in a protest parade. Turning to another example, the principal of The Grammar School offered jobs to individuals in the gang and granted the use of the school yard in return for their help in controlling some of the violence in the school and providing certain limited kinds of security for the school area.

Our project illustrated another important mechanism in exploiting environmental resources. We were a research project whose business was gathering data and information. Thus the negotiations were set up with us to allow us to use the storefront

Center for our information-gathering activities even while the Disciples were occupying it. But there was some very careful horse-trading regarding the conditions of use of the Center so that we could collect information. They were very leery and suspicious of information-gathering agencies. They did not want to give information freely. Many aspects of their lives could be easily regarded as nonlegal or illegal, and free dispersement of information about themselves was simply a foolish policy on their part. Moreover, the adjacent gang, The Latin Kings, had gone through the experience of being used by the police as an information-gathering unit. This may or may not have been entirely true but the Disciples themselves often referred to the fact that the gang had been used to gather information on narcotics, pushers, sources, and the like. And from the point of view of the gang we were really just another outside institution coming in to gather information and perhaps exploit them in using as means of gathering information. So we ran into heavy resistance to the more standardized means of gathering information such as interviews and were completely unsuccessful in attempting to train and develop the two gang leaders in the more professional kind of occupation of interviewing. This probably had much to do with their sense of danger and threat in regard to information.

But they did allow us to observe and to have a member of the staff present as a recreational supervisor, and through the process of participant observation and descriptive field notes on participant observation a good deal of information on the day-to-day life of the gang was finally put together. But the negotiations with us and the fact that they had something that was of value to us and could negotiate and trade off resources that we had for items or things that they had and we wanted, was an illustration of another important function of the gang for the boys who were members.

This then is a view of the gang from the inside. In subsequent sections we will discuss the gang from the point of view of parents, particularly NPRs and CPRs and will discuss the position in relation to the phenomena of "hijos de la casa" and "hijos de la calle."

(c) Culture and Social Relations.

Cultural factors played a key role in our original proposal, as a mechanism to explain the development of educational problems and, with the accumulation of educational problems, the development of certain social disabilities. During the course of research we continued to consider cultural phenomena, but began to recognize that cultural differences and misunderstanding could exist without having serious consequences in school failure or reduction of access to better jobs. The key to occupational consequences seemed to be the way in which the cultural differences were used in hierarchization of people and relationships in institutional organizations. This latter issue will be discussed in the subsequent sections on education and occupation. This present section reports on the study of culture arising out of our original conception of the problem of educational problems and occupational disabilities.

Culture and Interpersonal Behavior in the Home. In Puerto Rico, the movement of adolescent girls outside the home is severely restricted, particular to prevent her being alone with males her age and older. Through the eighth grade student questionnaires we attempted to clarify the nature of the restrictions that are placed on the Puerto Rican girls in their relationships with boys as contrasted with the NPR girls in this same age range. We had anticipated finding evidence that the restrictions on girls continued to hold with some strength among the CPRs as well as the Puerto Ricans who had been here for a shorter length of time. We attempted to do this by first asking students about strictness of their parents and then turning to the question of how free girls were to go places without being accompanied by an adult or some other person regarded as a kind of modern day duenna or chaperon. In this eliciting procedure we turned up a strong thematic emphasis on safety and security as the basis for being accompanied by someone else rather than protection of the girls' virginal reputation. This theme was evident in the replies of the NPRs as well as from the replies from Puerto Rican portion of the sample. Thus the restrictions on the movement of Puerto Ricans as compared to North Americans and in particular Puerto Rican girls became a minor theme in the sample responses to the various facets of this subject.

In general, the youths regarded their parents as strict. Over 75% of the youths indicated that the adults at home were strict on them. (See Ques. 4.1, Table 2) The CPRs were 100% in agreement with the idea that adults at home were strict. This 100% might be compared with the two-thirds each of the NPRs and PRPRs who agreed about parental strictness. While the difference between CPRs and the other students may have no significance, it may also reflect the generally "tighter ship" that the highly mobile CPRs in our household sample displayed. (See Ques. 4.1, Table 2)

We explored the youths reported relationship with the mothers and fathers and the question of relative strictness. We found that the students, particularly the Puerto Ricans, got along better with their mothers than with their fathers. The response was strongest among PRPRs where 100% said that they got along better with their mother than with their father. The CPRs held an intermediate position with 60% indicating that they got along better with the mother and 40% divided between getting along better with the father and getting along with both equally well. The NPRs showed a somewhat different split in pattern, about half and half between getting along better with mother than with father and one indicating that he got along with both parents equally well.

The personal relationship reported by the PRPRs with their parents reflects a relatively well-known pattern about the organization of Puerto Rican households in which the father is held in some awe and is regarded with a rather formal level of respect. Underneath this awe, there is a full sense, in the modal family, of the father caring a great deal and being strict because he cares. This impersonal basis for affection is often misunderstood in North American contexts where more personalistic, companionship relationship dominate in the father-children role relations. We find then that the culture code characteristic of Puerto Rico holding over into the Chicago setting, but the code shows evidence of an intermediate degree of change with CPRs. That is, CPRs hold a less extreme position on describing their relationship with the mother as being better. The sample is small and one cannot lean too strongly on it, but it suggests that this may be a firm empirical finding about the cultural experience of Puerto Ricans in the United States. In other words the experience in the city places a great deal of pressure on the parent-child relationship and the culture coding governing that relationship. It is one area where great intercultural stress may occur and this domain may display what we describe as cultural antinomy rather than complementarity.

The relationship with the mother, however, is apparently not because Puerto Rican mothers are less strict. We asked which parent is the more strict of the two. The Puerto Ricans tended to indicate, but not in the majority, that one parent was not stricter than the other. When we asked which one was the more strict an equal number said both were equally strict as responded that the father was stricter. One of the keys to the easier relationship that seems to obtain between the mother and Puerto Rican youngsters is the fact that they describe her as more understanding and cooperative. This does not mean however that she is not strict. So while the mother is not likely to be stricter than the father in Puerto Rican families one often finds that mothers and fathers are equally strict. If, however, one is stricter than the other, it will tend to be the father. (See Ques. 6.01, 6.10, 6.11, Table 2)

The form of strictness revealed some differentiation between the NPRs and the Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. 4.2, Table 2) The North American sample more frequently indicated physical kinds of punishment were used to express strictness, while the Puerto Rican youths reported in milder tones that their behavior was "corrected" or that they were told not to do something, or what to do.[69]

In their responses the students indicated that the parents were strict about a variety of things including smoking and grooming, but among the Puerto Ricans the idea of being strict about staying out or running around was a prevalent theme. The NPR responses are scattered. One has the impression that the Puerto Rican youngsters experience some focal strictness around their physical movement, which initially we might have related to the stronger restrictions on girls, but that might be equally a manifestation of the anxiety about safety on the streets in the neighborhood.

Physical movement of the youths was liable to receive attention from the parents. We further explored this by asking about the idea of being chaperoned. And we explored just who might be the best chaperon. Thus we asked about older sister, older brother, younger sister and younger brother. (See Ques. 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, and 8.3.4, Table 2) It is clear that among the Puerto Ricans the older sister is the preferred chaperon. The NPR sample clearly favors no one as a chaperon, but if anyone must, the NPRs favor their older brother. The Puerto Ricans, both the CPRs and the PRPRs, on the other hand very definitely favor an older sister as chaperon. The older brother is of nearly equal favor with the Puerto Rican youths. Younger sister and younger brother are definitely "out" for the North Americans and are not very well favored by the Puerto Rican portion of the sample. One PRPR accepts both the younger brother and the younger sister as a chaperon, if one must have a chaperon. The reason we ask about who might chaperon, who might accompany one on the street, relates to the fact that in Puerto Rico the restriction on the freedom of girls in their early teens is accomplished in many cases by making sure that a younger brother or younger sister goes along with her. But, of course, the responses to the questionnaire reflect not the view of parents, but the point of view of youths themselves. The clear indication of opinion on the part of North American NPR youths that younger brothers and sisters definitely are out is in contrast with the less definite response of the Puerto Ricans. Yet safety overrides the other factor in the considerations of who must be accompanied by another person when going out. This point is reflected in the reasons given for preferring an older sister or older brother as chaperon. The NPRs emphasize that the older sister would by nosey. But the Puerto Ricans emphasize that the older sister would be understanding and also would be knowledgeable about getting around. They favor the older brother for the same reason. And when they discuss younger brothers and sisters the youths indicate that they do not know much about life outside the home, not even as much as the youth him or herself. Thus the theme among the CPR youths is knowing your way around outside the home and having someone with you who helps protect you from the danger, knows the world outside, and the world of the street. A number of the North American youngsters suggested that an older brother might have a car, which may account for the fact that 50% of them mentioned that an older brother was more desirable as chaperon. But, they too indicated and emphasized the safety factor when choosing an older brother.

When asked whether parents allowed them to go out with friends without adult supervision, we have a clear indication that the NPRs are allowed to do this. But from the Puerto Ricans and among the PRPRs there was a notable difference between CPRs and PRPRs indicating a more conservative attitude on the part of the parents of PRPRs toward allowing them out with friends without adult supervision. (See Ques. 10.1, Table 2) When asked what kind of events a girl should be permitted to attend with a boy, the restrictions on the Puerto Rican girls tended to show up in the responses of the PRPRs. Two-thirds of the PRPRs said that there were no events that a girl should be permitted to attend with a boy. The NPRs indicated a positive answer to the question with only one person being doubtful about a girl being allowed to attend events with a boy. And the CPRs held an intermediate position on the question with 40% indicating that there were some events that girls could attend with boys, but there were also 40% who did not answer the question at all. This suggests that there might have been some feeling of ambiguity in the CPRs' response. Finally with respect to the question of whether a boy should be chaperoned there is clear indication of feeling from both the NPRs and the CPRs that he should not be chaperoned. Two of the Puerto Rican girls indicated that a boy should be chaperoned and while this may be a classic case of sour grapes, it may also indicate a tendency of the Puerto Ricans, even with respect to the boys, to be somewhat more conservative about the movement and freedom of movement of boys outside the home. (See Ques. 17, Table 2)

This may be a question of age. In response to the question of when parents granted them the freedom to go out without supervision, the NPRs tended to respond with greater frequency in terms of the age at which the priviledge was granted. They were granted this priviledge at the age of ten to twelve while the Puerto Ricans tended to mention ages of thirteen or fourteen.

The thematic emphasis on safety in the Puerto Rican youths' discussion of parental restriction on the movements outside the household is reminescent of Mencher's discovery in New York of the process and concept of hijos de la casa (children of the house) as contrasted with hijos de la calle (children of the street).[70] That is one way Puerto Rican parents tried to cope with both the physical dangers of the street to their children and the moral danger of the bad influence of other youths--to violate Puerto Rican culture code, as well as the influence toward drugs, fighting, and crime (seen by Chicago parents to be epitomized in the street gangs).

We found this impetus of Puerto Rican parents not only to restrict young children, adolescent girls, but the young teenage sons as well. The ideal was to have a special room, preferably a basement room where they would stay when not in school, or with the family, or working part-time (which many, many of the youths did). To amuse themselves, often pool tables were added to make the "nice basement" room more attractive. We will discuss the question further in relationship to the parents' report on the efforts to restrict the movements of their children.

The general picture is that Puerto Rican youths are more restricted than are North American youths. But the basis for the strictness in both cases has to do with safety as much as with traditional codes of rules relating to restricting movement. At a number of points one finds evidence for greater restriction on young teenage girls, a pattern of culture continuing to operate in the lives of these youths in barrios of Chicago. Thus while the responses to these questions have not been definitive, the picture of a normative code that reinforces the field data from participant observation shows that the Puerto Rican girls experience a good deal of stress from cultural contrariety between household culture and the North American code concerning young female behavior. In comparison with North American girls their freedom to attend events unchaperoned by an adult or perhaps an older sister, are severely restricted. The culture of the institutions dominated by continental codes permitted and encouraged increasing freedom of movement as early as ten to twelve, safety on the streets and physical security allowing it.

One of the codings for interpersonal relationship that we investigated with respect to the family, as well as with respect to the school setting, was what we called the "joking relationship." It refers to the interaction that North Americans ordinarily called teasing or kidding. But teasing is one end of the continuum that further along the continuum, to its polar opposite, reaches a point that North Americans would call baiting, or perhaps bullying, or hectoring. We observed in the interaction between teachers and students the apparent fact that the teachers' teasing often reached a point that, from the point of view of Puerto Rican students, approached baiting. The behavior reached that point somewhat earlier along the continuum for Puerto Ricans than for their North American teachers. In Puerto Rican terms, baiting and hectoring showed lack of respect for the person whom one was attacking with sarcasm or some other form of joking.

Again there is, of course, a joking relationship and the allowance of teasing between certain classifications of people in both cultures, but the way in which certain actions are coded in that relationship and the degree to which they are coded as approaching the negative or still being on the positive side of baiting, seems to differ in the two cultures. It is a difficult concept to deal with verbally since directly translatable words may be used in the description of the relationship but the behaviors to which they refer may be different. That is, the behaviors are differently encoded by directly translatable words. Nevertheless we felt that we would try to explore the joking relationship in terms of how students' feeling it acceptable or not acceptable for it to occur between certain classes of people, (what might be called role types).

We used the term "joking-around" and *se relajan*. We were torn between the problem of expressing joking-around in English and finding a single Puerto Rican-Spanish phrasing that would carry the kind of intermediate meaning that we had in mind. Thus we decided to use the phrase *se relajan uno al otro* to suggest some kind of relaxed joking or teasing. Thus we hoped we had the perspective of some reduced degree of joking in both English and in Spanish.[71] However even this crude procedure gave us data on how the same relationship holds for adults to young in the household as compared to adults to young in the school. We first examine the relationship in the school and then turn to the relationship that we asked about in the home. In regard to the school we asked whether joking around was acceptable between male teachers and male students. (See Ques. 28.1, Table 3) The CPR youths were evenly divided between whether it should occur or not. Over 70% of the PRPRs were against the idea that joking-around between a male student and a male teacher was acceptable and appropriate. The North Americans on the other hand clearly accepted joking behavior between male teachers and students. In this culture contrast, the CPRs stand in an intermediate position, between NPRs and PRPRs.

One may turn to the father-son relationship and ask the same question about it, that is, is joking-around between father and son acceptable. (See Question 43.1, Table 3) In this case again, the NPR sample is clearly in favor of joking around between father and son. There is definite complementarity between the father-son interaction with respect to joking and the male teacher and student. In this instance there is a small tendency for the Puerto Ricans to find it unacceptable but the larger majority in both the CPR and the PRPRs indicate that it is an acceptable relationship. Thus in the opinions of students there is contrast in regarding this same type of relationship between adults and young in the household and adults and young in the school.

Let us turn now to the possible parallel between a female teacher and a male student in the school and a mother and son in the home. In the school it is clear once again that the NPR sample feels that this is a perfectly appropriate way for female teachers and male students to behave toward one another. The CPRs hold a general position in favor of its being appropriate although about 16% say "no." On the other hand, among the PRPRs nearly as many, 57.1%, say it is not acceptable as say it is acceptable (42.9% say yes). (See Ques. 28.4, Table 2) Turning now to the students' opinions about the relationship between mothers and sons we once again find the NPR sample fully in favor of this as an appropriate relationship. The PRPRs are almost equally divided on the question. The CPRs are 75% in favor and 25% against. The position on female teacher and male student and mother and son are approximately equivalent for the NPRs. (See Ques. 43.2, Table 4) But for the Puerto Ricans it is not a clear-cut choice; certainly it can occur that a mother and son, and seemingly a female teacher and a male student, can joke around; i.e., the two relationships are similarly viewed.

It is of course, simply the matter of a joking relationship occurring between an older woman and a younger male student that seems to create the interpersonal problems we observed during fieldwork, but the idea on the part of some young Puerto Rican males that the female teachers were picking on them. We think in this case there is a difference in the coding of the actual actions involved in the relationship and that for some reason the manner of North American female teacher rather quickly approached the point where a Puerto Rican boy regards it as baiting, while an American boy might still regard it as a matter of joking or teasing and not having gotten to the point of hectoring or baiting. In particular we propose that the use of sarcasm is different in the two cultures in the joking and teasing relationship and that the Puerto Rican, particularly the Puerto Rican males, are much more sensitive to sarcasm and baiting than are the North American males. But verification of this perspective will have to await a different instrumentation, to test our proposition regarding significant differences in the teasing-joking relationship in the two cultures.

Let us turn now to younger female, older male relationships in the school and household. Again the North Americans find it a perfectly acceptable relationship between male teachers and female students. The CPRs are again in a somewhat intermediate position, two-thirds say yes and one-third say no. But the PRPRs are definitely against the relationship with 85.7% indicating that it is not an acceptable kind of behavior for a male teacher to joke around with a female student. (See Ques. 28.3, Table 3) We compare that school relationship with the father-daughter relationship, although it may be argued that this is not the appropriate parallel in this case. That is if the male teacher is young enough it could be a heterosexual relationship that was in the making but this of course would not hold for the father-daughter relationship (short of incest, of course). Differing rules may be applied in this case. In the students' reactions we find again the North American sample feels it is a perfectly appropriate kind of relationship. In this case the CPRs are in full agreement with the North Americans, fathers and daughters can joke around, but the PRPRs are in a much more ambivalent position, 40% of the sample not answering (which we feel in a number of cases is an indication of ambiguity) but 40% as compared with 20% saying it is not an appropriate relationship between father and daughter. Thus in some sense the PRPRs response is in the same direction for fathers and daughters as for male teachers and female students.

After spending a year in school, or part of the year if a drop out, the youths showed some interesting changes and stabilities on their views regarding joking relationships. In 1969 the CPRs often showed an intermediate position between the NPRs and the PRPRs, although there were contradictions in that pattern suggesting that adaptation to a new environment is not always the classic shifting along a continuum from first culture to second culture. But the youths' views on the same relationship, were elecited during follow-up interviews with the following result. The NPRs found acceptable, the PRPRs found largely unacceptable, and the CPRs were divided on the acceptability of a joking relationship between male teachers and male students. (See Ques. 28.1, Table 3) The 1970 CPR respondents all had a positive reaction to the relationship and thus had converged with the NPRs. (See Ques. 15.4, Table 11) The PRPRs still were strongly negative toward the occurrence of the relationship and the NPRs were as positive as ever.

In their views on the father-son joking relationship, the 1970 results are similar to that for male teacher-male student relationship. The CPRs in 1970 are even more strongly in favor of a joking relationship between father and son, but the PRPRs display the same divided perspective but more strongly in the direction of saying it does occur. Thus, there is overlap or a parallel in the father-son male teacher-male student relationship for CPRs that should result in easier adaptation on the part of male CPRs to kidding and teasing on the part of male teachers as a method of control and attention-giving. But PRPRs are negative about the male teacher-male student joking relation, suggesting that the logic of extending aspects of father-son relationship into the school is too simple-minded. Thus for PRPRs the culture code of acceptable or appropriate behavior dictated that the father-son relationship should contrast with the male teacher-male student relationship with regards to a joking and teasing behavior.

The next comparative relationship is the comparison of the joking relationship between female teacher and male student, with mother and son. In 1969 the NPRs favor kidding between female teachers and male students, the CPRs also accepted it, but the PRPRs were equally divided on its appropriateness. In 1970 the CPRs are as positive toward it as are the NPRs, but the PRPRs are still negative about a teacher s joking or kidding a male student. The parallel familial relationship between mother and son in 1970 showed two-thirds PRPRs said mothers and sons are not inclined to kid around. But all the CPRs and the majority of the NPRs said mothers and sons are so inclined. Again CPRs are more like NPRs in their evaluative coding of the familial relationship between mother and son and the school relationship between teacher and male student. Thus CPRs should have less difficulty with teasing behavior from a female teacher and should be able to engage in kidding repartee, since he has had practice with his mother. The question is whether the behavioral referents of the terms are the same. So, little action can be taken on the basis of this verbal result alone. But the verbal results do suggest the PRPR male students will have too high probability of conflict with teachers and particularly female teachers to attempt to use joking and teasing as a mode of social interaction. Again there maybe a difference in the behavioral referent for the description, but the domain of joking, we propose, is an important relational area for adult-youth interaction.

The PRPRs in 1970 were somewhat more negative than 1969's respondent's about a kidding relationship between female teacher and student. But CPRs had shifted even further in the direction of the NPRs, regarding it as O.K.

But the male teacher-female student relationship holds an interesting reversal in the pattern of CPR convergences with the NPR positions on joking relationships. In 1970 the NPRs are still entirely positive about joking in this relationship, but the CPRs in 1970 are, like the PRPRs, much more negative about such kidding. The PRPRs in 1970 are more strongly negative than before, and the '70 CPRs are as negative as the PRPRs were the previous year. Thus, we discover a reversal in trend that comes as a surprise to those viewing the data with an acculturative continuum model in mind.

The same reversal occurs for the CPRs in 1970 with respect to the father-daughter kidding relationship. In 1969 all CPRs agreed it was acceptable, but in 1970 half the CPRs say they are not so inclined. The PRPRs have maintained a similar level of negativism toward the kidding relationship. But as before, the NPRs find it acceptable. It is perhaps interesting to note that male CPRs, as much as girls, are negative regarding father to daughter kidding. Thus, the male teacher, female students and father-daughter relationship may have cultural features in common, that our methodology tapped but did not clarify. Male high school teachers may be well advised to exercise caution in kidding and teasing the Puerto Rican female students. We will try to relate this reversal to other cultural stresses we discovered in the lives of Puerto Rican girls.

The kidding relationships among peers shows some changes also. The CPRs and PRPRs are favorable toward kidding between female friends, and NPRs are so disposed as well. (See Ques. 15, Table 11 and Ques. 22.1, Table 3) NPRs maintain the same position toward two boys who are friends but the CPRs shift in a negative direction toward the more negative PRPR response, though the majority clearly favor kidding between two boys. (See Ques. 15.0, Table 11, and Ques. 22.1, Table 3).

Kidding between boys and girls in 1970 is regarded as negatively as in 1969. (Ques. 15.3, Table 11 and Ques. 22.5, Table 3). NPRs and CPRs who favor the relationship in 1969 now show much less favoritism. Perhaps the growing significance of heterosexual relationships in their lives has begun to change the place of teasing and kidding in boy-girl relationships.

This discussion, so far pointedly focusing on culture coding of social relations illustrates the way we anticipated culture differences would be related to occupational disabilities in our firt forumulation of the relationship of culture difference to the kinds of educational problems that lead to low-opportunity occupational careers. Obviously the limited number of domains and types of relationships in the discussion barely scratches the surface of the vast numbers of domains and relationships that might be described for the full-range of educational and occupational institutions, where culture differences and complementarities might contribute to problems of occupational failure. But to describe all the potentially contributory differences goes beyond the initial goal of locating those culture conflicts that most often and most generally contributed to educational problems. But in investigating the problem, even in this limited way, our conception of the way culture is causally connected, changed. That is, cultural differences of the order we have just described may produce affective stresses and related, cognitive disorientation, but their actual entry into causal connections with subsistence arrangements requires that the cultural differences and complementarities be used in the sorting and arranging of people for limiting or facilitating their likely access to economic or work-career-related resources. One of these connecting phenomena long known by social scientists but now receiving new attention under the label of "labeling," is the kind of process that, in complex corporate societies, sets up the causal ties between ethnic culture and subsistence arrangements.[72]

Thus there was a weakness in the initial formulation of our problem, in addition to the methodological weakness already referred to which will be discussed in the section Discussion of Results. As a consequence of the shift in our conceptual model from focusing on culture difference per se to the way culture differences and complementaries are related through labeling to the social organization of the distribution of resources, we will place our further discussion of culture in the context of the discussion of educational and occupational ideologies.

(d) Educational Ideology, Ethnicity, and Social Organization.

Although educational and occupational ideology are presented as different topical areas, for this project their interrelations are important. We point out these interrelationships throughout the presentation of empirical results. There are other factors, such as social organization, that are particularly important to the connections between education and occupation that will be attended to very closely in the course of presenting the material on educational and occupational ideology. Certain beliefs concerning culture coding of social relations in general are also more coherently related to the contexts of their occurrence, in this case, the educational setting, and by extension their occupational setting, and so the questions concerning culture will be further dealt with in close connection with the settings in which they occur.

Ethnicity. The general hypotheses guiding the research would lead us to expect that ethnicity, or the interface between Puerto Rican and non-Puerto Rican students, was in some way involved in the interpersonal relationships in the elementary school. Part of our purpose was to find out the nature of this relationship and through the questionnaires, to establish the principal sample students' inter-ethnic perspective on each other. We accomplished this through a number of questions, some of which asked about attitudes and judgments of the other ethnic groups at a very general level and some others of which asked questions of how ethnicity would operate at the level of close friendships and clique-mates.

We first began by asking the students whether they liked the people they went to school with. The question was deliberately non specific and in their own minds could have included the whole population of the school or those students who were in their classroom and with which they had the closest daily contact. (See Ques. 74.1, Table 5) The principal sample, in general, seemed to like the students they went to school with, with the interesting exception of about a third of the CPRs. A third of the CPRs responding indicated that they did not like their fellow schoolmates. This theme of dissatisfaction with the school and with some of the people in the school, including other Puerto Ricans, turns up not as a dominant theme of the CPRs, but as a repeated minor theme. For the Chicago Puerto Ricans, it may be an emotion that is associated with assimilative socio-economic mobility. The Puerto Ricans reported no strong indication that they feel they are treated differently by the rest of the students. Their perception is that they are treated the same by their fellow students as are other students. Only one PRPR and one NPR reported that they felt they were not treated the same as other students in the school by their fellow schoolmates. Perhaps this result is not really surprising in the context of the high density of

Puerto Rican students who are in the school. One would expect the Puerto Ricans to see themselves as treated no differently by their fellow students. One might, however, have expected more NPRs to show signs of being treated differently. We should note that 40% of the NPRs did not answer this question. (See Ques. 77.0, Table 5) Both the NPRs and the CPRs feel that there are some in the school who do not like Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. 66, Table 4) However the PRPRs do not see it this way. The entire group of PRPRs deny that there are such people. The PRPR reaction may be due, in part, to their perception that most of the students in the school are Puerto Rican; but the CPRs seem to have more experience with the possibility of hostility. One of their explanations of why others do not like Puerto Ricans is that the others are jealous. But another CPR comments that the Puerto Ricans pick on the other students, implying that the hostility felt by the NPR students toward Puerto Ricans may be incited by the Puerto Ricans themselves. Thus one gets an inkling of the school life of the NPR students in a school where they are a very definite minority. Understandably there are advantages to being Puerto Rican in such a school, a decided majority of students would be expected to say that there are advantages. (See Ques. 54, Table 4) Curiously the CPRs tended to give negative responses to this query, and in greater numbers than usual did not answer the question. Thus again we discover this minor theme playing through the responses of the CPRs of dissatisfaction with aspects of the school and to some degree with their own ethnic group.

One of the important aspects of any school from the point of view of the students is the extracurricular activities and the extra academic value system that often can be taped in American student systems by popularity; so we asked about who were the most popular of students, first in the school, then in the grade, and finally in the respondent's own room (formally called the home room). We then coded the responses of the students by the ethnicity of the other students whom they mentioned. And we find in their responses the clear evidence of the dominance of the Puerto Rican students of the student value hierarchy.

The NPRs also named Puerto Ricans as the most popular students in the school and in this manner suggest that they are part of a single value system, that is they have not formed a separate counter-student culture to the dominant Puerto Rican one. We could not determine from the names alone whether the Puerto Ricans mentioned were most frequently CPRs or PRPRs. However our own wide acquaintanceship with a number of the students mentioned led us to think they were largely drawn from the CPR group. (See Ques. 44.1, Table 4) There is other circumstantial and some direct evidence in favor of the conclusion that the most popular students tended to be taken from the CPR segment of the school population when we reason from the data that students from the top reading classroom (and from the tutorial that includes underachievers from the top two reading classrooms) all of whom we know were most frequently mentioned in the choices of the most popular students made by the sample students. The students in these top groups are very predominantly CPR students and we propose that these are the students that tend to dominate the student segment of school social organization.

One limit on the Puerto Ricans' general domination of the popularity systems was in the NPRs' limit on accepting this dominence in the homeroom. In response to the question about the most popular student in their own classroom we find that 40% of the NPRs responded (and one of the CPR students mentioned) some NPRs along with Puerto Ricans. Since most of the NPRs in the sample were taken from the top reading group, we are dealing, in this response, with youths who are in the room with the highest proportion of NPRs in the whole of the eighth grade.

We used a number of sociometric type of questions to explore the question of sentiment towards North Americans and Puerto Ricans in the eighth grade. We asked whether they liked North Americans and with the exception of one PRPR the general response was yes, they did indeed like North Americans. (See Ques. 12.1, Table 1) We also asked them whether they liked most Puerto Ricans, making sure that they did not think that we meant that all Puerto Ricans had to be liked. Again we got a very positive response. All of those who responded said yes they did like most Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. 12.2, Table 1) Following up on these rather generalized, and somewhat inocuous questions, we asked whether they had any North American or Puerto Rican friends, and asked that they name some North American friends. In response the indication was that CPRs and PRPRs did have NPR friends except for one CPR. The two previous questions had required the students to apply ethnic labels, and in our analysis, we wanted to know whether they could apply these labels to best friends. The responses that they gave to the previous questions were then coded in terms of whether the persons mentioned had been mentioned earlier among their best friends. The general pattern was that the North Americans mentioned NPRs selected from among their best friends. On the other hand North Americans mentioned by Puerto Ricans in response to the question tended not to include names of North Americans or names of students included among those that they earlier mentioned as being among their best friends. This suggests that Puerto Ricans tended not to think of best friends with ethnic labels. (See Ques. 13.1.1, Table 1)

All of the respondents mentioned Puerto Rican friends and 50% of the NPRs named Puerto Ricans in response to this question of who were among their best friends. The Puerto Ricans largely mentioned other Puerto Ricans in response to the question of who were among their best friends. We had discovered, however, that the Puerto Ricans tend not to name North Americans among their best friends t NPRs tend to include Puerto Ricans among their best friends. Thus while NPRs chose both Puerto Ricans and North Americans for best friends, Puerto Ricans tended not to choose North Americans among their best friends. But the significance of this question is that we had asked the students themselves to label the people as North American or Puerto Rican, so that we know that we have their classifications of individuals as North Americans or Puerto Ricans, and we are not simply relying on the appearance of the surname as North American versus Puerto Rican. In another question we asked our students to "Pretend that a person like yourself has just moved into the neighborhood; which people would you tell them to have as best friend?" The responses were coded for ethnicity of the individuals named, and an interesting pattern developed. In response to this question we found that the Puerto Ricans tended to name Puerto Ricans and the NPRs tended to name NPRs. (See Ques. 11.0.1, Table 1)

Language. Language is of course one of the focal phenomena in the relationships of the Puerto Ricans to their North American English language dominated environment. Thus we investigated the principal sample's views on language as well as their reports on whom they used Spanish or English with, what they used Spanish or English for, and what they felt about language. The students' perception of the language that other students in the high school use is perhaps a function of the language they use with one another. Thus we asked if the students with whom they attended school knew only Spanish. In response to this very general question the PRPRs tended to view their schoolmates as speaking only Spanish. However when we asked subsequently whether their schoolmates could speak either English or Spanish the PRPRs responded in great majority that, yes, they could speak both. (See Ques. 75.1 and 76, Table 5)

The first question should probe how they used the language codes interpersonally. We first asked them about what languages they used with various categories of persons in their immediate family and household. We asked about the use of English or Spanish with mothers, fathers, older sisters and brothers, sisters and brothers near the respondent's age, younger sisters and brothers, etcetera. We found heavy usage of English or both codes among siblings. With respect to the mothers we found of course that the NPR sample used English all the time. This is not a foregone conclusion, however, because we did have some East European immigrants in our NPR sample and conceivably could have had a response from among the respondents that they used some other code than English with their mothers. However the one NPR case that we knew did not use English or Spanish had left the neighborhood and the school at the time these questionnaires were given out to the eighth grade.

Over two-thirds of the CPRs and three-quarters of the PRPRs use Spanish exclusively with their mothers. (See Ques. 58.1, Table 5) One-third of the CPRs and a small 12.5% of the PRPRs used both languages with their mothers. With respect to the fathers one PRPR student reported that he communicated exclusively with his father in English. Fifty percent of the CPRs and 62.5% of the PRPRs communicate exclusively in Spanish with their fathers and 50% of the CPRs and 12.5% of the PRPRs use both language codes with their fathers. (See Ques. 58.2, Table 5) Queries about siblings and the relative age of the siblings was important in that we felt that the code used for siblings may reflect the differing point in the domestic cycle at which immigration took place. With the older siblings none of the group reported exclusive English language code. On the other hand the PRPRs reported that approximately two-thirds used exclusively Spanish with their older siblings. The CPRs reported that they used both codes and some 25% of the PRPRs reported using both codes with their older siblings. As one goes down the age level of the siblings one notes a slight tendency for the students to report an increasing frequency of the use of both codes with siblings. (See Ques. 58.3, 58.4, 58.5, Table 5) The CPRs show 100% use of both codes with same age and younger siblings. One PRPR reported the exclusive use of English with respect to same age and younger siblings, but while 50% of the PRPRs use exclusively Spanish with same age siblings, only 25% use exclusively Spanish with younger siblings. The conclusion one can draw from these reports is that younger siblings in the household are exposed to both language codes from their older siblings who are in the North American schools. This is very much the case with the CPRs suggesting that these children are bilingual when they arrive at school. And it appears to be increasingly the case with the PRPRs. In other words younger siblings of 50% of our PRPRs use English with older siblings. This sibling language phenomena has gone largely unrecognized in educational circles. But the younger children in the household acquire their English language code from their older siblings. They are not deriving it from parents with much frequency. On the other hand they are not likely to speak the register of the English language code spoken by the teacher when they arrive in school, since the register would be that appropriate to children dominated contexts.

Professor Loy's discovery that the Puerto Rican youngsters appear to be learning the peer's version of the English language rather than the teacher's version of the English language even from their experience in school adds further significance to peer language. (See report on language study, Appendix B)

We followed up this detailed question with a general question about whether there was anybody in the household with whom the individual speaks English all of the time or nearly all of the time. It was another definite way of getting at the information that we had gotten from the earlier question. No mothers were mentioned in this instance by the Puerto Ricans. This reinforces what we had discovered earlier. One father was mentioned by a PRPR. All other cases were siblings. (See Ques. 59.1, Table 5) The general responses to the question indicated that two-thirds of the PRPRs and one-third of the CPRs had no one in the household with whom they spoke English exclusively, or put in a more accurate way, 25% of the PRPRs and one-third of the CPRs reported that there was someone in the household with whom they used English language code exclusively. (See Ques. 59.0 and 59.1, Table 5)

Use of language codes for communication within the household is only one of the usages of language codes outside school, of course. One of the important roles that we found youngsters who are learning English play is that of translator. Thus we asked the students whether they ever translated for anyone. We found that the NPR sample reported never using this role. This is perfectly understandable yet it is also probably indicative of the fact that they did not learn Spanish. (See Ques. 60, Table 5) All of the CPRs responding to the question indicated that they did fill this role for someone and only 25% of the PRPRs reported not serving this function at some time. The students served in this capacity in a number of situations including school and communications with neighbors and in stores. They fulfill the role most frequently for parents but also for neighbors and friends as well as other relatives. (See Ques. 60b, Table 5) This points up that there is functional demand for bilingualism in the neighborhood and that junior high age and even younger children were utilized in adult communications. It suggests that a very relevant kind of orientation in a bilingual-bicultural program, if these children had access to one (which they did not) would be teaching them how to be effective translators. It is well known that translators are not born but are made, except at the level of the highly skilled simultaneous translators.

We have discussed the perspective of the students themselves on what the language of their peers in school is. Many of the PRPRs see their peers as using Spanish only although they report with few exceptions that their peers know both English and Spanish. (See Ques. 75.0 and 76.0, Table 5) Perhaps the next question, with bilingual usage so prevalent in the environment, is to ask what their sentiments are toward the two languages. The students reported a pattern of language preference that one might well expect although there were more PRPRs reporting a positive preference for English than might have been expected. (See Ques. 57.0, Table 5) As we would expect over 40% of the PRPRs preferred Spanish over English, but nearly 30% liked both and one of the respondents indicated that he preferred English. The CPRs showed a decided preference, two-thirds of them, for

English. A small proportion liked both and another CPR preferred Spanish. The NPR sample reported 60% preference for English but interestingly enough 40% of them indicated that they liked both languages. The rather heavy CPR preference for English and the relatively small preference for Spanish, we think reflects the exclusive training that they have gotten in English in the school. Our own experience was that many of them are illiterate in Spanish although they speak Spanish in certain key domains in their life, for instance in the household. But we found that when they spoke to Spanish-speaking people outside the home, in many instances they had to switch to English because the vocabulary of the topic or subject they were discussing they only knew in English because they had no experience with conversational domains in Spanish. In the CPRs' attitudes, we find an expression of wasted linguistic resources of this population, growing out of the exclusive English language programs that they experience in the elementary schools for the most part.

Further exploration of attitude and feeling re languages corroborated the judgments we had reached on the basis of field observation. We asked them if they would like to study Spanish. We found that two-thirds of the CPRs said that they would like to study Spanish. An equal proportion of the PRPRs said that they would like to study Spanish, but 25% of the PRPRs indicated that no they would not like to study Spanish.[73] The NPRs were equally divided on whether or not they wanted to study Spanish. Their tendency not to want to take advantage of the extraordinary opportunity of studying Spanish in a situation where one could develop a high level of conversational competency in Spanish is astounding, but not extraordinary, in light of the kind of indirect indoctrination that the NPRs were getting from the school that knowing Spanish interfered with knowing English. Thus by indirection knowing Spanish was not a highly desired good. (See Ques. 61, Table 5)

A great preponderance of PRPRs liked to read in Spanish but only two-thirds of the CPRs and one of the NPRs liked to read in Spanish. (See Ques. 62.0, Table 5) Only one CPR reported being able to write in Spanish very well. On the other hand over 87% of the PRPRs claimed they could write very well in Spanish. The NPRs, of course, claimed they could not write Spanish at all and two of the CPRs indicated they could not write Spanish at all. Again the response reflects the general loss of a resource on the part of the CPRs. (See Ques. 63.1, Table 5) Not all of those who knew how to write Spanish liked to write in Spanish. Approximately two-thirds of the CPRs and the PRPRs reported that they liked to write in Spanish. With respect to English all the students of course reported that they read in English at school. And with the exception of one spoiled response, the students reported 100% in favor of reading in English. (See Ques. 64.2, Table 5)

When asked about their preference with respect to the two languages only two PRPRs indicated a decided preference for Spanish, and a little over one-third of the PRPRs reported that they liked both and two-thirds of the CPRs indicated they liked to read in both. If given preference one-third of the CPRs prefer English. (See Ques. 65, Table 5) All the CPRs with the exception of one preferred to write in English; on the other hand the PRPRs were equally divided between those who preferred to write in English and those who preferred to write in Spanish. (See Ques. 66, Table 5) Perhaps for more pragmatic reasons three-quarters of the PRPRs would like to study some of their subjects in Spanish. When they reported the subject they would like to study in Spanish the modal choice interestingly enough was math. Fifty percent of the CPRs and over 40% of the PRPRs wanted to study math in Spanish. (See Ques. 72.2, Table 5) Even 40% of the NPRs indicated that they would like to study some subjects in Spanish. However, over 50% of the CPRs indicated they would not like to study their subjects in Spanish. Again the CPRs show their tendency to be intermediate and in the direction of the North Americans in their attitudes toward Spanish. (See Ques. 72.1, Table 5)

Thus there is a degree of negativism expressed on the part of CPRs and on the part of some PRPRs with respect to the Spanish language and its use. We found a good deal of sentiment on the part of the PRPRs for bilingualism, but surprisingly less positive sentiments on many questions for using both languages on the part of the CPRs. We interpret this as, at the very least, a loss of a very valuable intellectual resource on the part of the CPRs, brought about by negative attitude toward Spanish as an interference with learning English.

In some ways, however, the attitudes and sentiments that have been reflected may depend upon questions of competency. And we ask a few questions about areas of competence and the development of competency. As we have already indicated in our discussion of the question to the students about whether they can write in Spanish, the CPRs are obviously much less confident about their ability to write in Spanish. As to training in English, we found that all of the PRPRs reported experience in studying TESL or the process of being taught English as a second language. One-third of the CPRs had experienced TESL but two-thirds had not. We were interested in the children's own pedagogical theory about how one could learn English the easiest. They did not have a lot of new techniques to offer but the distribution of the types of theories is rather interesting from the ethnic point of view. The NPRs who were not themselves faced with the problem of learning a second language when they did respond tended to favor speaking with native speakers or watching television. (See Ques. 69, Table 5) And one of the CPRs goes along with that approach. However the PRPRs tended to favor the more institutionalized kinds of approaches indicating that going to school or just studying were really the key ways of learning to speak English. A similar proportion of the CPRs favored those techniques although one mentioned taking lessons. One enterprising PRPR suggested using records and two simply suggested one start when one is very young. It is clear then that the children undergoing the process of learning a second language generally wished for some kind of structured approach. There may, of course, be an ethnic difference here. That is, it may well be that the Puerto Ricans prefer more structured approaches to the learning of a second language than the NPRs would even if the NPRs were faced with the same pressure to learn a second language in order to function properly in a new environment.

There is clearly no doubt in the minds of these youths that English is necessary for doing well in school, for going into college, and for getting a good job. One hundred percent report that English is important in all the three situations. (See Ques. 67.1, 67.3, 67.5, Table 5) When asked whether English is absolutely necessary in order to get along in Chicago, however, two of the PRPRs and one of the NPRs indicated that it was not, reflecting some pragmatic awareness that English is not an absolute when it comes to living in Chicago. On the other hand, if one wants some of the better things in life such as doing well in school and going into college and getting a very good job they are thoroughly convinced of the necessity to know English. This suggests that there is no lack of motivation for knowing English.

Indeed our general results in examining the language attitudes is that there is a rather high degree of motivation on the part of PRPRs and clear preference for English, if not denigration to some degree of Spanish, on the part of the CPRs. We are convinced then, not only from this numerative data, but from our own observations that the language problems of the Puerto Rican youngsters that we encountered in the eighth grade were not a matter of their lack of motivation and desire to learn English. We frankly think it is the pedagogical situation and that the institution itself was clearly having language difficulties. One might, from the point of view of language, regard the school as having an instructional disability, if institutions can be thought of in those more anthropomorphic terms.

Teachers' ideology. One of the first questions we asked the teachers in their interviews was whether they expected more from students in terms of performance than they got from them. We discovered the teachers with more experience immediately responded that they of course expected more from their students than their students were able to provide because that was part of being a teacher. One always had high expectations. This included not only higher expectations with respect to their performance on their academic work, but many referred to their high expectations with respect to behavior. One of the male teachers linked the high expectations with respect to behavior to the students' standing on the reading achievement scores. That is, they were next to the top group in reading achievement and they should have behavioral characteristics in keeping with their "higher ability." Two of the three younger teachers apparently had not learned in the teacher socialization process this aspect of teachers' professional ideology. These two teachers who were in their first year of teaching indicated low expectations. The young teacher who taught the lowest tracked eighth grade group, and was having an enormous amount of difficulty with that group, had very little expectation of performance from the group. The other young teacher simply gauged her expectation by the test scores of the group. Thus, she said the lowest group, taught by the other teacher, had no ability to work up to. All the other groups had differing degrees of ability potential and her expectations were structured in terms of their standing in the ability groupings. The value of this young teacher's perspective is that while standard ideology of teachers said that one must have high expectations of students we found that the lowest track group of students, composed mainly of recent arrivals--Puerto Rican students or students who had a combination of a bad behavior reputation and serious problems with schools, including serious problems with using English, did not share in being objects of this ideology. Her words reveal, in naive responses, the position of that group in the minds of the teachers. And on other occasions the public declaration by teachers of their view of this group was an important part of the structuring of the overall organization of the classes in the eighth grade. (This is discussed in further detail below.)

The behavioral expectations expressed by the teachers toward their own homeroom students were high. It should be remembered that they were older, more experienced teachers and had learned the art of and had developed the skill for establishing the condition described as "control." In the case of the two least experienced teachers there were serious problems with their as yet undeveloped skill at controlling large groups of students, which generally ran from forty to forty-four students to each classroom. Consequently they were much more pessimistic about behavioral expectations. The young teachers of the lowest track stated that the lack of proper behavior was a serious interference in accomplishing the academic goals he had in mind for this group. In brief, then, so far as expectation of performance and behavior is concerned the general ideological position of the teacher is that one "always expects more from the students than they can produce because that is the way you set goals."

But expectations regarding cultural adaptation was a strange concept to the teachers. The teachers did not seem to have conceptualized the behavior performance or attitudes of their students in cultural adaptive terms. With one exception, the teachers had not thought a great deal about maintenance of Spanish language or

Puerto Rican culture but focused mainly on the view that speaking Spanish interfered with the process of learning English, with learning the North American way of life an important but secondary consideration. The two older male teachers, at first, simply said they did not understand the meaning of cultural adaptation. One subsequently said he saw no problem with Puerto Ricans' cultural adaptation (once he was convinced that there was some sensible meaning to even the notion of cultural adaptation). He stated that he believed the Puerto Rican students primarily regarded themselves as American citizens. He saw no question about their assimilation to the North American way of life, since they did not regard themselves as "Spanish" or Puerto Rican or any other kind of special group, but were all assimilated to primary identity as American citizens. He then qualified his position by saying that he did not mean for them to forget their mother tongue because he encouraged them to read in Spanish and if they did not know how to read in Spanish, to learn to read in Spanish. But it was clear that his perspective was that their obligation was to assimilate to North American culture and take that as their primary identification. This perspective was clearly echoed in the views of five of the seven teachers. And this view was expressed in their discussions of their views about Spanish.

On this point their educational views were more definite and firm. Five of the seven teachers were quite outspoken about reducing the amount of Spanish that was spoken by the children in school. One of the younger teachers said she saw no reason to reduce the amount of Spanish spoken among the students themselves so long as they developed good facilities in speaking English when it was demanded by the teacher. Two of the older teachers had made very strong rules about speaking English. One said he "reminded" and the other said she "ordered" the children not to speak Spanish even among themselves. For example, one teacher said that during the early months of the school term he had to "remind" the children over and over again, when they were lining up or going from the classrooms to leave the building, to talk English, not Spanish.

This suggests that Spanish was regarded in a negative sense by most teachers. But the full weight of the judgment of this being evidence for negative teacher attitudes toward Spanish language must be tempered by their response to the question about whether they would like to be fluent in Spanish themselves. Every one of the teachers said that he/she would like to be fluent in Spanish and bilingual. Five of the six clearly wanted to be bilingual in order to communicate better with students. They had in mind being able to explain ideas more fully to the newly arrived students. All the teachers went so far as to support explicitly and voluntarily the idea of bilingual teachers in the school, not simply teaching English as a second language but bilingual teachers to give subject matter instruction in Spanish in the school. Their view on bilingual instruction suggests that they did not intend to denigrate the Spanish language directly, although the manner in which they emphasized exclusive use of English in situation after situation very likely had the effect of denigrating Spanish in the eyes of the students. As we have shown there was evidence of a certain degree of negativism toward Spanish, and its use, among eighth grade students (see "Language" above).

As to the key and fundamental problem with the educational situation of Puerto Ricans five of the seven teachers located the main problem in the area of language. Although only one spelled out language per se, specifying it as primarily what he called the bilingual homes of the children, the other three referred to their lack of ability to read in English. Thus, reading and lack of reading was seen as the key source of their educational problems. The other two teachers saw the primary cause of educational problems of Puerto Rican youngsters as somewhat different in its basic terms. One thought that learning to live in a society different from Puerto Rico and facing inevitable discriminations was the key source of problems for the Puerto Ricans. Although she, too, in all fairness, referred to the language problem as a key feature, thus making six out of seven who specifically located the basic problem in the language area, in the Puerto Ricans' use of English in conversation and in understanding or in reading. However, the other teacher was quite clear in locating the problem in another area. She specifically said she felt it was lack of commitment to the significance of education and high motivation to do the things in the classroom that the teachers assigned or wanted them to do. She explicitly stated that the lack of reading ability, from her point of view, was not the problem even when one was teaching the lowest group. She said, "Give me students who are motivated to learn and I will teach them to read." She said, "I know how to teach these children to read even those who must learn to read in a second language. But what I can't do is give them the impetus and motivation to do the things I tell them to do in order to learn to read." Thus from this teacher's point of view the basic cause of the key problem that she located is lack of motivation. The causes that the others mentioned had to do with underachievement because of lack of confidence in their ability that might in turn be related to the fact that the classes are so big that the teachers are unable to interact with individual students often enough to build up their own sense of their ability to do things. Another teacher located the cause in the lack of respect for authority that he related back to culture. Finally, in a kind of reversal of the whole thing one of the teachers indicated that not knowing enough English was due to lack of motivation which was caused by their language problem. Another teacher said the language problem was due to the "bilingual home," that is, parents did not speak English. (Note earlier finding on sibling English.)

There were several intercultural and interpersonal characteristics of the Puerto Rican student population about which we asked or to which the teachers themselves referred. We asked them whether Puerto Rican students tended to ask very personal questions, an intercultural problem that has been remarked on in the literature on classroom interaction between North American teachers and Puerto Rican students. Among our teachers four of the seven teachers said, yes, Puerto Rican students ask questions that are too personal. Three said no. But one of the four who said yes to the question went on to say their questions were no more personal than any other human being who is asking personal questions, including the interviewer. Two of the teachers went on to elaborate on the Puerto Ricans' deep interest in their personal lives, in what was happening to them, and to their families. In sum, the Puerto Rican students did ask personal questions, but the effect of their interest and inquiries was variable depending on the teacher's own personal orientation regarding their privacy. And among the six teachers this ranged all the way from the insistence that they did not ask personal questions because the teacher did not get personal, to a point of taking pleasure in the deep interest that the children had in their teacher's personal lives and families.

A second intercultural difference that has been remarked on in many studies of North American and Latin interaction was the tendency of the Puerto Rican youths to come up and touch the teacher. The "touching character" of Latin culture in general has been discussed by Edward Hall in The Silent Language, in reference to the kinesics of interaction.[74] In these classrooms, there is a great tendency of the Puerto Rican students to attempt to touch teachers during verbal interactions. This bothers many teachers, according to one of the teachers we talked to, and is a source of distress to them. The teacher who brought it up, however, indicated that from her point of view it was part of the important quality of humanity in a teacher to respond to students' touching mode of interaction.

Another area of dissatisfaction from the point of view of teachers with respect to the Puerto Rican children was what might be called the independence-high-achievement syndrome. Part of this view was expressed through their negative reaction to the close and possessive relationship of the Puerto Rican mother to the younger children as young Puerto Rican children entered kindergarten and first grade. The teachers suggested that this led to a dependency relationship that interfered with the development of independent responsibility; initiative; and the ability to operate without supervised structure and direction. One of the teachers feared Puerto Rican youngsters did not have the strong drive to succeed. He vaguely related the lack of drive to succeed to Puerto Rican cultural background. In another case the lack of independence was related to the lack of the home's stress on doing things at one's own initiative.

The teachers in a number of ways expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of motivation for high achievement among Puerto Rican students and Puerto Rican parents. They feel students and parents _fail to emphasize_ the connection between the immediate acts of schooling now and long term goals for occupational success. The teachers repeatedly stressed that the parents did not have an educational ideology that connected day-to-day skill and problem resolution with the things the children needed in order to succeed in life in the very largest sense. Thus, in their view parents did not know what was going on.

And at the same time and in an almost contradictory sense, at least three of the teachers mentioned that the Puerto Rican students lacked respect for authority. By this, of course, they meant that they lacked the ingrained sense of responding to the demands and commands of the teachers. It was our feeling that this was one aspect of the whole syndrome of the difference between behaviors associated with _respeto_ relationships in Puerto Rico and respect relationships in North America. The term was used by both North Americans and Puerto Ricans. But the specific behaviors entailed in the relationship overlapped in part, but only in part. Thus the complementarity and overlap was incomplete. Behaviors were engaged in that were thought to be respectful behaviors according to North American patterns, particularly those North American patterns heavily influenced by north and east European varieties of North American culture; but those behaviors were violations of the respect relationship in Latin American terms. That is, they violated the students' sense of their own individual self respect and worth.

We increasingly began to feel that the difference in the relationship resided in the kinesic and non-verbal aspects of the interaction. That is, certain behavioral gestures, like joking interactions, were differently coded in the general domain of _respect_ and _respeto_. While we attempted to locate and describe in ethnographic terms the specific gestures that were involved, our effort to test this in the student questionnaires did not work out.[75]

When we asked the teachers to characterize the educational situation overall for Puerto Ricans, these same themes were echoed there, in somewhat different terms. One teacher said that the students were facing the same problem as the Appalacian whites: background values interfered with the orientation necessary for making them succeed in school. Another said that the language was the key source of problems and thus the school needed to have more Spanish-speaking teachers. We have already noted the lack of motivation theme from the teachers who said that basically the school resources are good although it would be highly desirable to have Spanish-speaking teachers and smaller class size. One just simply said that the situation for the Puerto Ricans was poor educationally, though there are some fine kids; i.e., there is just a poor educational orientation among the Puerto Ricans but there are some exceptions. Another teacher got down to the hard case of lack of available appropriate teaching materials for dealing with full language development in English for this special group of students. And finally, one teacher said that Puerto Ricans had short term goals; suffered from the language barrier; were not accepted by white people; and because they wanted to return to Puerto Rico, their whole educational situation was bad. Thus she summed up, perhaps, some of the key stereotypes regarding the Puerto Ricans, which may have expressed the positions of other teachers who were less naive and more sophisticated about expressing what they viewed as the problems.

It is clear we were not dealing with an entirely naive and unsophisticated group of teachers. And while there are misunderstandings that led to difficulties in teaching, led to student failure, and led teachers to view student academic failure as an inevitable indication of occupational failure, there was evidence that this generally pessimistic perspective on the part of the teachers was not accompanied by a negativism toward teaching Puerto Rican students. We put this question to the teachers very bluntly. We asked the teachers, "Do you want to teach Puerto Ricans next year or teach in a school with a predominance of Puerto Ricans?" Four of the teachers gave us very strong "yes" responses and indicated that they were very happy with teaching this population. Two others of the seven gave us positive responses, including the teacher that had most trouble with his teaching assignment this year. Only one of the six said that she preferred not to teach this population of students and that was one of the young beginning teachers. One of the two responses that we classified as moderately high came from a teacher that denied that Puerto Ricans were any different from other students, a bit of educational ideology that was very strong among teachers in the United States five years earlier. We feel that this response could well have been put in the strong yes category if the ideology had not tempered it. Thus, in sum, we feel that the teacher's attitude toward Puerto Rican students was very strongly positive. Our close contact with the teachers and our regular observation of them as they went about their jobs of teaching allows us to judge these responses as quite valid. We saw violence too, but recall the violence of the gang and that authority there was often reinforced through threat of violence.

Two of the women teachers were clearly deeply engaged and intrigued by the interesting challenges that the Spanish speaking Puerto Rican population of students offered them. One of these felt this strongly even though, as she related to us, her family was very fearful of the fact that she was teaching in a poverty neighborhood. They had been asking for the six years that she had been there when she was going to move to another school. The other teacher had a sister who was teaching in an upper-middle-class Jewish neighborhood and was often amused at the difference in the teaching situations. Both of these teachers felt that their skill as teachers had been tested and the fact that they could teach, according to the standards of their colleagues, and teach well was a source of deep satisfaction to them. Indeed, the very difficulty that new and inexperienced teachers had in these settings probably contributed to the older established teachers' sense of satisfaction in their own ability and skill.

There were somewhat different attitudes on the support systems available to them. All of the teachers, particularly the older teachers, were quite definite about their satisfaction with the support from the principal's office and the staff in the principal's office with respect to discipline and control. In the previous year there had been some dissatisfaction with the amount of paperwork that an earlier principal had demanded which, frankly, even from the observer's point of view, was the most extraordinary sight of pink paper that we have ever witnessed. It of course would have been politically unwise of these teachers to be critical of the administration. However the pink paper of the previous year had been so mountainous that in our participant-observer roles during that year we caught teachers at weak moments when their irritation overcame their political wisdom. So we knew that there was general dissatisfaction with that aspect of the previous principal's regime. However the principals had changed, due to the death of the other principal who had directed the school when we first began the project. The new principal had significantly reduced the amount of paperwork demanded of the teachers. Moreover, we did not find general dissatisfaction with the resources available to the teachers. On the part of one teacher, we even found a strong indication that she could teach around any such shortages as long as she had the right strong positive attitudes in the students that they wanted to learn. But she had supreme confidence in her teaching ability. Others did not fault the guidance staff or the principal's staff, but mentioned either programs or materials that would have been useful. And of course the younger teachers wished for better training and what they called "teaching orientation." Overall, however, the strongest agreement among the teachers about what was lacking was the presence of fluently bilingual Spanish-speaking, English-speaking teachers for this population.

This very demand of the teachers for Spanish-speaking teachers and colleagues in a sense highlights the difficulties that a principal might have in providing such resources. They were very supportive of the existence of the TESL program although from our observation the TESL program was a very weak substitute for the kind of full-fledged bilingual-bicultural program needed.

But the school system was centralized. That is, the central resources were at what is called "the Board" or the Chicago Board of Education. Monies were not allocated in lump sums to the districts or to the schools but were allocated in itemized programs and materials. Thus during the second year of our research the TESL program was removed from the school. So, far from having the resources to hire bilingual Spanish-speaking teachers, the principal was beset with the problem of having resources withdrawn for the one program that seemed to respond directly to the needs of the population. Secondly, the school was overcrowded and needed classrooms. The principal was engaged in a competitive battle of extraordinary political complexities in placing pressure on the Board to allocate the resources for renting space and obtaining mobile units. This involved his cooperating with the development of local community organizations including the Northwest Community Organizations' efforts to put pressure on the Board for school resources. Thus the principal was actually involved in local political developments not simply out of the goodness of his heart but as a mechanism for forcing out of the central board resources that he needed to deal with his own special student population.

A third factor which he had to deal with was the union. Thus what was the status of a bilingual Spanish-speaking teacher in the eyes of the union as compared with an established senior union member who was monolingual? There is a curious irony in all this because the union preferred the certified, unionized teacher. Several of these certified unionized teachers had had Spanish in college, but in no case were the college level Spanish courses sufficient to prepare them to speak enough to further develop their fluency in Spanish. In this respect, like so many others, university training either failed or was irrelevant to preparing teachers for teaching in this type of setting.

The principal's efforts to supplement the Spanish abilities of teaching staff already there in the form of Spanish language programs taught by a native speaker of Spanish seemed to lose momentum after the first few class sessions. True, many teachers who went to these classes held second jobs after school. Moreover, these classes, like the college classes that had not succeeded, mainly involved use of textbooks and the verbal delivery of an instructor. But ironically the very motivation that the teachers talked about needing from students in order to assure that they could teach them often was not remarkably present in the efforts at learning the complexities of the Spanish language.

With regard to the parents' interest in education we have already dealt with the general feeling that somehow the Puerto Rican parents did not motivate the children strongly to endure whatever the school had to offer in order to move ahead, nor, according to teachers, were they strongly indoctrinated in the inevitable connection between educational accomplishment and occupational attainment. All of the teachers regarded parent interest as key to the student interest and motivation in school. Three of the seven teachers felt that the Puerto Rican parents in general had an interest in the children's education. Others qualified by saying some do, some do not. The other two teachers indicated that they did not have focal interest in education. One teacher put this perspective mainly in terms of comparisons with certain other ethnic groups, such as Jewish parents and comparatively, she felt, these parents do not have deep interest in the education of their children. Only one teacher felt that the parents were sufficiently interested and his point was that they helped as much as they could, although he went on to say that many were unable to help because they themselves did not have sufficient education or were deeply involved with the demands of simple subsistance. All the other teachers indicated there was not enough interest although two teachers used the same argument as the other teacher to explain why there was not enough interest. One teacher spelled out the teachers' position quite explicitly. She said that both students and their parents were often simply concerned with survival. This often meant that the students did not have time to attend school. The parents themselves were so deeply involved with the whole effort to get enough food, to support themselves, and keep a place to live, that they had less than enough time to devote to support and indoctrination of their youngsters. But she went on to give examples of cases in which parents who wanted to help could not help and had come to her begging her to please to help them help the children.

Three of the teachers, however, had very strong convictions that the Puerto Rican parents simply did not have as much interest in school as they should have or could have. Their point was that they should participate more. Indeed all of the teachers felt that the parents should participate more and in this connection four of the teachers mentioned the need for more parent-orientation programs. Their basic motives seemed to be that they wanted the parents indoctrinated in the educational ideology that they, the teachers, had and that they felt were necessary to support the teachers' efforts. But two of the teachers who suggested this seemed to recognize that if this were done on school grounds and simply under school auspices, it would lose its force. They suggested that this effort be organized by such groups as ASPIRA or LADO. The other teacher suggested what he called a social center where teachers and parents might get together and an appropriate orientation to school could be developed on neutral ground.

Relating what we have said somewhat earlier to the problems of the principal in competing with other schools for the resources allocated by the central Board and the necessity for his turning to local community political development to gain those resources, the teachers' suggestion that the parents need orientation seems to relate to a tendency to see the problems of the students in the lack of adequate support from the parents, when, from an organizational point of view, there was a serious lack of resources in the organization of the institution itself. In this connection, we began to contemplate the whole notion of a disadvantaged institution. Resources were limited and program development was so circumscribed by the organization and system of allocation of resources by the Board that the institution itself which the students attended was disadvantaged and disabled in dealing with the special student population with which it was involved. We did not feel that the staff, in itself, was below average nor did we feel that the negative attitudes on the part of the teachers with whom we dealt was a major barrier to the improvement of the educational program. Certainly there were, we felt, inadequacies in the educational ideology and occupational ideology of the teachers; for example, they saw only school success related to occupational development and mobility of the students. Also, the teachers were worried about parent aspirations, as well as about other aspects of parental ideology. But the teachers' strong positive response to the question about having a working knowledge of Spanish, and their emphasis on their own desire to speak Spanish for better communication with the students and with the families, indicates a positive orientation toward these developments. And indeed, their readiness to support an instructional program that gives instruction in another language indicates that they are not negative toward bicultural development and support in the institution itself. While the explicit ideology of the teachers contains the seeds of denigration and negativism, their general attitude toward the Puerto Rican population seems to be positive. We now turn to the operation of this ideology within the context of the social organization of classrooms in the school to suggest that the social organization itself can, in effect, defeat the effects of even positive attitudes toward the Puerto Rican population.

Students' educational ideology. One of the key features of the teachers' educational ideology that we will discuss is their insistence that absenteeism, along with language, is the key to the Puerto Ricans' eudcational problems. They are often distressed by the amount of absenteeism, as well as by the frequency of residential turnover that they observe in their Puerto Rican students. But this emphasis on absenteeism was not strongly reflected in the students' reports on interaction between the teachers and students. Only 25% of the PRPRs reported that they were taken aside by teachers who criticized them for being absent. (See Ques. 78, Table 5) None of the other students, however, indicated that this happened to them. On further probing, we discovered that the group as a whole was not in complete agreement with the teachers' ideology on this point. When asked whether being absent affected their grades, the NPRs were much weaker proponents of this educational ideology since 60% denied that being absent affected grades. The CPRs were apparently more convinced of the truth of this key point in teacher ideology, but still one-third disagreed that being absent affected their grades. But the PRPRs were rather thoroughly convinced that absenteeism indeed affected their grades. Of course, these differing attitudes on the parts of different ethnic segments in the school population may reflect reality; not just easy opinion. It may indeed be true that absenteeism has less effect on an NPR's grades than it does on a PRPR's grades, a mechanism of self-fulfilling prophesy may be at work.

The students, particularly the NPRs and the CPRs, reported missing school because they were sick. But some of the others, and mostly PRPRs, reported not only missing school because they were sick but because they did not feel like going to school, suggesting the PRPRs are a population under stress. However, the students did not often mention that they missed school because they had to work at home, babysit at home, or meet some home obligations.

Reactions to whether or not they spend too much time in school were varied between the NPRs as compared with the CPRs. The NPRs and 50% of the PRPRs reported that they spent too much time in school. The CPRs struck a rather median reponse, two-thirds of them indicating that they spend enough time in school. Twenty-five percent of the Puerto Ricans said that they spent too little time in school.[76] The NPRs' reaction may of course be a reflection of the more generalized anti-school attitude that often occurs in working class North American populations. But the strong negativism of most of the PRPRs comes as no surprise given the general difficulties that they were undergoing according to our participant observer observations. We would venture to suggest that the negativism came mainly from being in the lowest eighth grade track in the school.

Apart from their opinion about how much time they spent in school, we found that about two-thirds of the youths liked school that year as compared with the previous year. (See Ques. 84, Table 5) Slightly over 50% of the CPRs liked it more this year, and 60% of the NPRs also felt that way. The PRPRs were equally divided between whether they liked school more or less than last year. But on exploring their explanation for their feelings, it was discovered that the PRPRs in particular and the CPRs tended to emphasize the fact that they were graduating this year and the eighth grade year was a graduation year. However, 60% of the NPRs mentioned having a better teacher than they had had in the previous year. Many of the students in the top class were very happy with the teacher they had in the eighth grade as compared with their seventh grade teacher.[77] When asked whether school work per se was better than it was the previous year, the PRPRs indicated that it was not any better but it was not any worse than it was the last year. Thus three-quarters of them liked school work about the same. Half of the CPRs liked school work better and the responses of the NPRs were scattered throughout the range of responses which the students offered us. (See Ques. 85.1, Table 5)

We asked the question, "Do you like anything at school this year?" Then we turned the question around and asked it from a negative point of view, "Do you dislike anything about school this year?" Since we implied that anything could be entered, we anticipated getting from the students a range of the things that their sentiments focused on, both positive and negative sentiments. One interesting overall observation on the series of questions regarding their specific likes and dislikes is that the PRPRs responded to the positive questions, but showed a poor response, i.e. a high proportion who did not answer, to the negative probes. This is rather consistent throughout the four questions, two of which were stated in the positive and two of which attempted to elicit negative perspectives about school. In contrast, the NPRs showed very definite and strong and clustered responses in the negative area. The CPRs also showed the capacity to respond to a negative frame and while their responses were not precisely the same as the NPRs' and were not as strongly expressed, they very definitely could give some strong negative opinions. The questioning about liking at least one thing in school drew over 80% positive responses from the PRPRs. The CPRs were equally divided suggesting that there was a reservoir of negativism there that one might not anticipate. The NPRs were approximately two-thirds positive, indicating that, yes, there was at least one thing that they liked about school that year. (See Ques. 36, Table 4) The kinds of things that they offered to explain why they felt as they did tended to cluster around subjects and certain classes. And there was a very general response, like "it was fun," that is quite recurrent in the category system of the students when they attempt to explain positive feelings about school. But it appears that teachers, subjects, graduation, and then the general categories fun and not fun were the key ones for understanding the students' mapping of likes and dislikes with respect to school.

Three-quarters of the CPRs indicated that there was at least one thing about school that year that they disliked. And there was an indication that the NPRs felt even more strongly about certain negative things about school. The PRPRs did not respond as the CPRs and NPRs did to very definite categories regarding what it was that they disliked about school. The CPRs and NPRs responded in terms of school in general but mostly in terms of subjects, other students and teachers. The question did not ask for a definite yes or no in response to the opening frame, "Do you dislike anything about school this year," but the coders assessed the overall tone or valence of the students' attitudes about school from their responses to the two questions. (See Ques. 37.2, Table 4) It was the coders' assessment that 40% of the NPRs, 50% of the CPRs, and 60% of the PRPRs were more positive than negative about their responses to these two questions. The CPRs and the PRPRs were equally negative in their responses and the NPRs were as frequently negative as they were positive. The PRPRs were approximately 40% negative and the CPRs were only 25% negative indicating a greater tendency of the CPRs to scatter their responses through the range of valences of attitudes toward school. Here, again, is a somewhat intermediate position of the CPRs. The suggestion seems inescapable as the CPRs show this classic aculturation position of intermediacy, that the CPRs in many respects are picking up the NPRs' cognitive mappings of the school, and assimilating therefore their North American peers' educational ideology.

Our overall assessment is that liking school is not a function of the nature of the grade nor mainly of the subject matter, but frankly of the teacher and the students' overall feelings about the activities of the room they were in as a social organization. The overall impression is that the NPRs and the CPRs have very definite likes and dislikes about the teachers, but the PRPRs are positive about having at least one school grade they liked best, but very vague about who were their teachers the year that they liked school. It may come as a surprise to adult-oriented mapping of school that students could explain their feeling by claiming that the reason they liked a particular year of school is because it was fun. And that is the modal response of the NPRs and the CPRs to the question of why they liked the grade they mentioned. The specific phenomenon that underlies the report that it was fun of course needs rather more definite exploration. But again there is a contrast in the PRPR mapping of the situation. Their responses are scattered as before, suggesting that our questions were not eliciting the categorical terms in which they were accustomed to thinking about school. But 80% did give us some response and the responses tended to be in terms of whether the teacher was friendly, ("friendly" was an important descriptor for this group with regard to teachers, judging by our participants observation) and the strategic placement of the eighth grade with respect to graduating. While the student mapping does not precisely overlap adult perspectives on school and what should be good about school, there is no question that good content, well-presented and a sense of having accomplished work and done a lot is a very important aspect of the youths' way of looking at and judging their school experience. It was also our observation that they tended to assign the term fun to sessions of subject matter that were well taught and in which the subject or teaching procedures elicited excited responses from them. In brief, they do value good learning experiences, or positive learning experience based on good communication from the teacher to the student, a good sense of productive accomplishment, and a lesson that provoked their interest and desire to respond.

The PRPRs' reluctance to respond to negatively framed questions is reflected in the fact that 50% did not respond to the question "For all the years you've been in school what year or years did you like least," despite the fact that 100% responded to the same type of question put in a positive framework. Thus we do not get much information from the PRPRs on this particular question, although some of the information that we did get suggests again a contrast of mental mapping, as compared with the CPRs and NPRs. The NPRs and CPRs clearly liked their seventh grade least. Some of the PRPRs mentioned earlier grade experiences that must have occurred in Puerto Rico. Thus they had some negative school experiences in Puerto Rico.

Culture and interpersonal relationships. The teacher-student relationship is governed also by certain codings that are sometimes strange to the student. Some behavioral gestures are differently regarded in the two cultures. Thus the manner in which a North American teacher wishes a student to behave when he or she is speaking to him is to look him in the eye in order to signal to the teacher that he or she is paying attention. Students of course can learn this; on having just arrived from Puerto Rico they come to school with a somewhat different coding which says that it is rude to stare a person in the eye for too long. Moreover if one is in a particularly formal situation with the teacher or is being corrected, then one is very careful not to look the teacher or the adult in the eye since it may signal defiance. Curiously, quite the oppostie is thought to hold when North Americans are regarding the situation. Looking away or looking down is regarded by a North American teacher as defiance or at least disregard, but this behavior in Puerto Rico is taken to indicate that the younger person who is being corrected is contrite and humble about what is being said. Mental recoding may occur very quickly in this behavior so that one may get a ready verbalization of the rule to look the teacher straight in the eye. Nevertheless, we observed cases of teachers who knew about the different coding on the part of Puerto Rican youngsters and yet, caught up in the emotion of correcting a Puerto Rican, the teacher would pull the child's face or chin in order to position his face and eyes to look at him or her, the teacher, in the face. We cannot say that the statements that hold in some of these cases on paper are the ones according to which behavior conforms in highly emotional situations such as being scolded or corrected by a teacher. Nevertheless we will briefly report the results of these questions.

One of the rules of interaction that is contrastive in Puerto Rican schools and North American schools is the acceptance in Puerto Rican schools of addressing teachers as "Teacher" and the strong resistance to this form of address on the part of North Americans. North American teachers insist on being addressed by name. We asked students whether they called the teacher by his or her name or whether they called them "Teacher" and only one PRPR said that he addressed the teacher as "Teacher." The explanations were rather varied but the modal one from Puerto Ricans was that it was a sign of respect to address the teacher by name. The less frequent explanations, however, were interesting in the distribution. Some Puerto Ricans indicated that they did so because it was a rule or they had been asked to do so. The North Americans emphasized the idea that using the term "teacher" rather than using the teacher's name was "juvenile." In sum, the students, including PRPRs, had learned the rule and there was indication of their having been carefully taught. Thus when asked the rule itself they can provide it. Although we do hear a more frequent use of the form of address Teacher rather than Mister or Miss by newly arrived Puerto Rican youngsters, it was a form of address that occurred most commonly in the lowest tracked students in the eighth grade.

We asked about the students' reaction to the manner in which a teacher tried to get quiet in the room. One typical way is to say "be quiet" and a stronger form of getting students quiet is to tell them "shut up." While the students took the latter more seriously we found that a few indicated that they got mad over this kind of response although most simply conformed to the request and got quiet. The two students who said that they got mad were Puerto Rican students. This form of telling them to get quiet may be regarded as a way in which the teacher displays lack of respect for the student or "talks rough" as some Puerto Rican students describe behavior they regard as lacking respect.

We also wanted to know from the students what they did when they got mad at the teachers. This is difficult information to collect on an open-ended questionnaire, but the responses clearly indicated that they had mechanisms for dealing with getting mad, most of which did not involve overt actions but could certainly be of the sort that would disturb a teacher. For example, they indicated that one way to deal with it was not to speak to the teacher and to refuse to volunteer anything. If a teacher employed the interactive socratic method this would certainly dampen the atmosphere of the room. However the responses are so varied that one can only get clues from them about the kinds of actions that take place.

Turning now to the response of a teacher when the teacher is addressing the student, we asked the students what they did and gave them a choice of four possible responses. Their responses indicate that they did follow the rule of looking straight at the teacher except for two students who looked at the ground. The Puerto Rican students said that they looked at the teacher in order to show respect; two-thirds of the North Americans indicated that they did it to show they were paying attention and one of the Puerto Rican respondents indicated they did it to show that they were afraid of the teacher. The gesture of looking at the teacher, of course, is not the same as looking him straight in the eye.

Although the questionnaire form that we have employed gathers some information on these subtle cultural differences, it is our conviction that the questionnaire is not a good instrumentality for the exploration of cultural rules.[78]

Another domain of students' educational ideology is grades and the relationship between work put in and the grades received. We found that the PRPRs are clearly in agreement with the notion that the most admired person is one who makes good grades and works hard to get them. (See Ques. 97, Table 6) The CPRs are strongly oriented that way although not completely because they see a person who makes good grades but does not seem to work hard or study much as perhaps the most admired person. The NPRs' responses range over admiration of the person who works hard and gets good grades to the person who makes average grades but does not seem to crack a book to get them.

There is no question in the minds of the CPRs and PRPRs that grades are very important to them. On the other hand, one of the NPRs feels that grades are somewhat important. Again, though, the number of respondents is exceedingly small, from the NPRs' reaction to questions about grades, there is a tendency to be less enthusiastic about the formal ideology of the school on grades. But the point is that the Puerto Ricans are not anti-intellectual about school. They do not indicate that the school is not important. On the contrary school, and the ratings they receive in school, are important to them.

One aspect of the positive mapping of the school is the way grades are perceived in terms of good or bad. Different groups allocate grades somewhat differently to the categories "good" and "bad." We find that there is some contrast between the NPRs and the Puerto Rican students on this point. (See Ques 99.1, Table 6) The Puerto Ricans would include in the category "good grades" not only "Excellent," or E's, but the equivalent of B's and C's in other grading systems. The NPRs on the other hand include only E's or A's in the general category of good grades. Thus the lower end of the category "good grades" for the Puerto Ricans reaches to a lower point in the grading scales than is characteristic of the NPRs. Bad grades show a similar tendency at the upper boundary. Clearly U's or F's are bad grades but one of the NPRs includes an intermediate grade that is not failing but is low, a D grade, as a bad grade. With the larger sample one might have indications again that the NPRs envision bad grades to reach higher up on the grade scale than is true for the Puerto Ricans.

The students, with the exception of one CPR, feel that they work hard for their grades. This question emphasizes that the students regard what they do in school as work, not as a process of receiving services from the adults who are around. Whatever the specific outcomes, or definite "output" from going to school in the form of certified labels and specific skills, students regard themselves as very active workers in this process. And what we have seen is that the Puerto Ricans reinforce this work ideology with their attitude that the most admired person is one who works hard and makes good grades. This perspective is strong in both the CPRs and the PRPRs. On the other hand the person who can make average grades and not crack the book is the person who in a way is beating the system. This means that someone is getting the output or the outcomes of the institution without investing work in it. And the fact that this could be mentioned as the most admired person by the NPRs suggests that the gentleman student ideology, perhaps the source of this value, is not part of Puerto Rican educational ideology at all but is part of the North American educational ideology although as a minor theme in the present era, but based on the themes of elite education of an earlier era.

Up to this point one has the impression that the PRPRs have not developed a consistent shared mapping for orienting themselves to the North American school. The CPRs display a definite one that shows close approximation of that characteristic of the NPRs, although not as extreme. But there is no question that the NPRs have a way of categorizing aspects of their school lives, of weighing these aspects in terms of positive and negative valuations and that this mapping articulates rather well, although it is not the same as, the mental mapping of teacher-student relationships expressed by the teachers. Thus one can say that the NPRs do logical mapping that at least is complementary with the teachers' ideology of the school. The CPRs' mapping is well on the way to being that simply because they seem to be taking over the NPRs' way of viewing school world. We would suggest that the PRPRs' orientation is an example not of contariety because the PRPRs mapping is indefinite, but scattered cultural differences, that have as yet not consolidated into a consistent cultural contrariety and conflict.[79]

Teachers' background and ethnicity. The teachers of our youth sample were not the prim cadre of middle class American teachers. We collected data from twelve teachers in all, from five teachers who taught the youth sample while they were in the second semester of the seventh grade, and from seven teachers while they were teaching members of our youth sample in the eighth grade. All of these teachers were born in the United States and five of the twelve were born outside Chicago. Two were from the South, one Black, and one White (the White had come to Chicago to live, however, when he was nine years old) one came from the Midwest, another from the East, and another from the far Northwest. Of the six teachers who taught our group in the eighth grade, three were second generation European ethnics. English was the second language for one of these teachers. Thus the older teachers, those over forty, had had the experience of some degree of assimilation to a school culture which was different from their household culture, although, again, there may have been the kind of cultural overlap that has often been noted for Jewish household culture and school culture. In many ways, the teachers' view of the acculturation problems of Puerto Rican youths whom they taught was greatly influenced by policies and attitudes that they had experienced during their lives while they were undergoing culture contact and adaptation. That is, their orientation to what should go on was strongly influenced by the assumption that mobility required full assimilation to the dominant culture and language of the school, with little regard for the status of the mother language and the mother culture of whatever ethnic group in question.

A few of the younger, new teachers, on the other hand, offered more liberal attitudes toward the use of the first language, although even they did not necessarily respect the first culture. They too seemed to feel it inevitable that mobility required assimilation to the dominant culture, and would involve conflict with and loss of the first culture, and indeed, perhaps the first language. One young seventh grade teacher trained in TESL was as adamant about preventing the use of Spanish in school as any of the other teachers and indeed was ready to apply rather strong-arm measures if necessary to insist on the use of English at all times. The cultural circumstances of the Puerto Ricans were not new to the over-forty group, for they had lived through eras when varying political philosophies regarding cultural difference and political loyalty or economic respectability had been obtained. Thus simple inter-ethnic experience did not in itself automatically prepare teachers for adopting a culturally relative or culturally plural approach to either the educational or occupational ideologies as they applied to a minority group. Because these teachers had been from ethnic minorities and had succeeded in attaining mobility positions, they were in some ways even more resistant to a culturally pluralistic approach to the problem of cultural acquisition than those who had not experienced this phenomenon in their lives, such as, for example, the teacher from rural Iowa and one of the younger male teachers who had come from Memphis to Chicago when he was nine years old. (It is perhaps unfair to describe this young man as not having gone through a minority experience, since he probably was associated with Appalachian Whites during his childhood.)

However, one must be fair in evaluating the attempt to predict the cultural orientation and the educational and occupational ideology that would characterize the teacher from their own inter-ethnic background. The relationship is no simple one. The teachers own ethnic background experience may heavily influence this, but it was our impression that the further socialization into the occupational subculture of teaching also had great influence on their cognitive orientation toward linguistic relativity and cultural relativity. Indeed, there were a number of instances where individuals were, on the one hand, relativistic with respect to language but were very assimilative with respect to culture and culture code. On the other hand there were other individuals who seemed to be more relativistic with respect to behavioral codes but adamant about the use of English and disparaging, even disapproving of Spanish. They favored the elimination of the use of Spanish in the school context. Then, of course, there were those who were clearly cultural assimilationists as contrasted with cultural relativists. Only the one man who taught some of our sample in the seventh grade and who was born in the South but came to Chicago in childhood closely approached what one would call a linguistic and cultural relativism in his educational thinking about the Puerto Rican students and in his perspective on their occupational possibliities and their occupational future.

Social organization. One of the important propositions that emerged out of the first year's field work was that even positive or relatively neutral inter-ethnic attitudes could have denigrative and inhibitory effects on minorities because of the way their attitudes, views, or cognitive mappings entered into and rationalized certain organizational arrangements that lead to differential allocation of opportunities and means of accessing further opportunities. While we concentrate this formulation on schools, since that is where most of this study's data are drawn from, the basic principles underlying the specific proposition can be applied to any agency dealing with minority groups.

The basis for the social organizational feature of the school on which we will focus, is the phenomenon called homogeneous grouping. This involves grouping a set of children according to some criteria, usually based on some kind of test score. The basis for the grouping is to cluster the students according to their rank on some test, a reading achievement test; a verbal ability test; a math ability test; or some test offering a basis for rank ordering. One might indeed have homogeneous grouping simply according to behavior, including estimates of such things as maturity and conformity, but these are not common formal bases for grouping children, although through "teacher judgments" they become part of homogenous grouping. One teacher did suggest that homogeneous grouping might better be based on the level of motivation to do well in school than on reading scores. Behavioral classification is not out of reason in the minds of some professionals in the educational setting and they can mount strong arguments in favor of such bases for grouping. However, grouping is generally done on the basis of some kind of academic achievement or skill score.

In the case of The Grammar School, the grouping was based on reading achievement scores, specifically, reading English. We were told by the principal and the people in the guidance department (called the social adjustment office) that all of the students in eighth grade were rank ordered on reading scores, although we did not observe the actual process of allocating the students into these groups. So, we cannot verify the claims that groupings were based on reading scores. However, our own observation and queries to the teachers indicated that there was usually a range of reading scores in a given classroom, although the average for the classroom might stand in the rank order from the top to the low fifth ranked ordered class. We also observed that during the eighth grade year of ~~our~~ principal sample, there was some redistribution of students according to social behavior in the classroom, with efforts to locate them in a class where a teacher could "control" them. However, according to our observations, this kind of redistribution happened less often during our principal sample's eighth grade year than it did during the following year when we went back to visit The Grammar School and talked to the teachers once again.

In the interviews, the teachers were asked whether they favored homogeneous grouping. All of the teachers favored homogeneous grouping. The four older teachers and one younger teacher very strongly favored it, two other younger teachers saying simply "yes." The rationale for favoring homogeneous grouping was that it made teaching easier. Some teachers were very strong about the necessity for homogeneous grouping, indicating such phrases as, "It's the only way," or "It's the best and only way," or "Yes, definitely."

Our proposition is that the homogeneous grouping based on the educational ideology that it is easier to teach students who are homogeneously grouped, was the source of an organizational arrangement that exacerbated the already difficult incipient problems of the Puerto Rican youngsters with language difficulties and culture code differences for social behavior. The full development of this proposition will occur later in the discussion of social organization. However, here we will spell out the educational ideological bases for the social structural effects of this organizational feature.

One of the other features of the school that contributed to organizational difficulties of the Puerto Rican youths was the school records; the files. These records are student folders that include not only the records of IQ and achievement scores, but records of student behavior in the form of a pink slip that was a kind of currency of "nonconformist behavior" on the part of the students. A slip was made out to describe the deviant behavior of the student by the teacher involved in the correction, and with this, the student often went down to the adjustment office for correction by one of the assistant or associate principals. The threat of being sent to one of the associate principals was part of the control system that existed in the school. As we have indicated in another query to the teachers, the teachers were all quite satisfied with the "disciplinary support" system of this school which indicated that the front office was very supportive of them when they sent students down to the adjustment office to be corrected by an assistant principal. Thus, the pink slips provided the negative behavioral record of the youngster. Not all of the teachers were happy with the records or even used them. Only two teachers praised them without qualification. One of the two younger teachers indicated that he did not use them and he thought they were bad because it led to prejudging of the students. Others made use of the records, but with some caution. Thus, in summary, the records, including anecdotal records as well as score records, were used to some degree regarding students. These behavioral histories fed additional information into the social organization of homogeneous grouping.

Another aspect of the social organization was that the label of the students' rank ordering on reading carried over to other kinds of definitions, expectations and conceptualizations of the students. The reading scores so sorted the students that those who had been in the United States the longest had the best command of English, and in many cases came from the most advantaged homes in the neighborhood including many from the Spanish-speaking homes, were in the top group. Since we do not have income data for the whole eighth grade, (we were unable to secure it under circumstances of confidentiality) we cannot confirm the economic correlation. There were students in the top levels whose families were on public assistance, but for certain circumstances, public assistance, supplemented by other income such as social security and disability income, might place their family into an advantageous social and economic condition vis-a-vis other families in the neighborhood that might have greater earned income, but had greater difficulty in managing their subsistance because of a larger family or the need to utilize baby-sitting services of one of the students to cover family obligations of a working mother. But those are external characteristics that might be correlated with classroom rankings. From the point of view of the internal organization of the school, the important thing was the degree to which the students at the bottom were regarded as the lowest on a whole range of dimensions of behavior and traits. We have already indicated that the teachers' high expectation of performance was directed at the students at the middle to upper ranges. But the teachers who worked with the students in the lower ranges, including those teachers who went to the group for departmental purposes, had low expectations of the lowest group and made this publicly explicit to the students, all the students. The expectations of student behavior, thus, were graduated by groups according to their standing in the rank order of reading scores.

A further graduated rank ordering was the occupational expectations. According to the interviews with the teachers, those in the upper two groups were regarded as students who had the best chance or the ability to take advantage of the chance to reach "college-type" jobs. Those in the middle range were expected to complete high school and reach high school-type occupations. The lowest group was regarded as having little likelihood of completing high school, and certainly a low likelihood of going to college.

Another dimension along which the groups were graduated was along behavioral dimensions mentioned by teachers, such as respect for authority. The top group was regarded as a group that had learned to respect authority. One of the teachers explained that students "not accepting authority" applied to "not the upper-level classes but the lower-level classes." The lower groups, particularly the lowest group, Room 302, were regarded as having, in decreasing degree, learned respect for authority. Room 302 was denounced often, as one teacher described it as "that mob in 302."

One of the teachers echoed our observation that a number of young teen-age Puerto Rican males seemed to have problems with maintaining a Puerto Rican definition of masculine role behavior in the face of the North American pattern of exercising authority and control. Initially, we have hypothesized that the conflict was mainly with North American female teachers because their authoritative behavior with respect to young Puerto Rican males violated the male dominance characteristic of male-female relationships in Puerto Rican culture. However, one of the male teachers mentioned the problem of having in his class boys whom he described as young men. This is consistent with the PRPRs being characteristically overage for the grade that they were in, due to their past history of migration, and of being placed "back" in the schools, in a perhaps misinformed effort to deal with their language problems. He experienced conflicts in exercising authority, and attributed it to the fact that the boys were no longer boys but young men, and so regarded themselves. Thus we have found indications from the male teachers that they, as well as the female teachers, experienced conflict with young Puerto Rican boys who were reaching fifteen and sixteen, although they were in grades where the usual age in North America is thirteen years.

This suggests, then, that there was cultural difference in the meaning given to certain behaviors, whether the authority in question was a male or female teacher, and which often led to misunderstanding of the intentional state of mind of the teacher. While the misunderstandings in themselves might not have led to more than personal animosity, the conflict inevitably led to the boy's being labeled a behavior problem. The documentation of this label by pink slips and incorporation into the class-ranking system resulted in serious school-career consequences. Many of the students placed in 302 were just that, behavior problems. Their behavioral difficulties often increasingly led them in the direction of placement in that group. Having been placed there, they were then subject to all the low expectations and labeling that was directed toward that group not only from the teachers but from the students who were not adverse to chiding and teasing those associated with the lowliest of the lows in the school. One teacher extended ranking on reading scores to general ability by saying that "302 had no ability to work up to." The other groups were described by this teacher in order of ranking: "They tried but don't have much ability," "They worked to their potential," "Their work is below potential," until she got to the top group which she described as doing the best work. Thus her own views of students' working to their potential were largely graduated in terms of the rank ordering of the groups. The most damaging kind of attitude, an attitude that seemed to be widely shared among the teachers, was that the lowest had the least ability.

Another mechanism by which 302's reputation was broadcast was by means of the other teachers who went to the group for departmental purposes, to teach some special subject like music, science, math. One teacher, on returning to her own group, was repeatedly observed to warn her own group not to "bug" her for a while because she had just come back from "you-know-where and you know what kind of group that is." These attitudes were certainly not lost on the students themselves. We found in one of the interviews with one of our samples, the expression of the view that all peers were nice peers "except those in 302." One of our bilingual field interviewers was relatively successful at helping to "control" the class and had a very positive attitude toward them. Her preference of dealing with this group, a group that mainly spoke Spanish among themselves, was greeted with astonishment in the teachers' lunchroom when she indicated that preference.

The teachers were very concerned about certain rules of the school and the classroom about which they listed having problems with some of their students, particularly Puerto Rican students. These rules are as follows:

1. Attendance and regular attendance.
2. Arriving on time and tardiness.
3. Verbal courtesy behavior, that is saying please and thank you.
4. Respect for authority, which has already been discussed.

5. Following first come first served rules such as lining up or cuing up rather than crowding around or failing to wait one's turn in speaking.
6. Lack of independence and the constant need of supervision while performing work.
7. Failing to stay in their seats.
8. Difficulty in staying quiet.

All of these behaviors were of concern to teachers. On each of these dimensions 302 was rated worst. At the same time 302 students spoke more Spanish, spoke less English, and were regarded as most likely to return to Puerto Rico. And whether it was a self-fulfilling prophesy or not, they most often did. Perhaps the other great institutional disadvantage from which 302 students suffered was that they had the most inexperienced teacher in the eighth grade. In the following year one of the experienced teachers stated, "It's a crime that (teacher) was assigned that group during his first year of regular teaching, simply teaching home mechanics was no preparation for that sort of thing." In summary, we feel that the institution itself which lacked Spanish language instructional facilities, clustered students' language problems in one group and associated them with behavioral problems that led to their being labeled with the most negative characteristics from the evaluative system of the school. These problems led to clouding of their actual intellectual abilities, whether they were low, moderate, or high, mainly because of lack of Spanish language instructional facility.

Social labeling then set in motion the development of educational problems. To the students dealing with the problems, dropping out seemed to be a solution. In the absence of an occupational ideology that strongly supports and emphasizes occupational mobility by working full-time and attending school, dropping out of regular school to get a job was a determinant life-time career choice. Dropping out was not viewed as making a choice for an alternative mode of approaching occupational mobility (perhaps understandably from the point of view of teachers' vested interest in schooling) but was presented as the absolute end to routes to higher occupations. But dropping out need not have been regarded as so much the end of all possible chance for success in occupational terms. If redundancy of opportunity exists then if one optional path to occupational mobility fails, others may exist.

We feel that realistically, opportunity redundancy is a feasible means for socio-economic mobility, even in the ghetto. But we also claim the occupational ideology of the school had a negative effect on optomistic search for alternatives. The only local institution that did seem to offer a different view and resources in support of the optomism was the street gang.

Students' view of social organization. We have discussed eighth grade school organization from the teachers' point of view and from adults' view of the formal system. There is also a students' social organization and it is important to have some knowledge of students' social organization in order to understand student motivations and perspectives. In addition to participant observation, we inquired about aspects of social organization in a number of questions included in the student questionnaires. We will discuss the student questionnaires and supplement them from our field note observations on social organizations.

On a personal level, friendship is a very important thing to a student. Students say people become their friends at this age because they trust them, or, a more frequent response, they keep their confidences. On the other hand, there are people whom one dislikes if one is a student in a system like this. The reasons for disliking them had to do with two key perspectives. One was that the students were snobbish, a perspective shared among the NPR and the CPR samples. But another reason for disliking another student was his being a troublemaker or harassing one. Harassment and troublemaking were common to all three of the subgroups' view of why one did not like some other students in the school. (See Ques. 10.2, Table 1) Boys always recommended other boys as friends; however, girls recommended boys as well as girls as friends to a new arrival in the neighborhood. They chose these recommended friends from among peers rather than from among older people or adults. (See Ques. 11.0, Table 1) With respect to ethnicity, Puerto Ricans recommended other Puerto Ricans for friends, while over 80% of the NPRs recommended North Americans or NPRs, although one did recommend Puerto Ricans. Thus, among the students, the social organization of cliques and of best friends tends to be intra-ethnic, although as one moves from first choice to third, the NPRs will increasingly recommend Puerto Ricans as best friends to the new arrivals in the neighborhood.

This same pattern holds for recommendations for friends to new arrivals in the classroom of the individual in question. (See Ques. 11.1, Table 1) As one goes from first to third choice, the NPRs will include Puerto Ricans and the Puerto Ricans will include a North American. This suggests then, from the point of view of very close friends, that there is a tendency toward an ethnic boundary, but that friends that are not the very best friends but are good friends will tend to be chosen from across the ethnic interface. The other organizational suggestion from these results is that the NPRs choose Puerto Ricans sooner in terms of degree of closeness of friends than does the Puerto Rican. And it appears that from the point of view of the students' system, the Puerto Rican students are dominant. That may not be the case in those sectors of the social organization that are mainly controlled by teachers, that sector of the organization we have already discussed. That is not to say the teachers could get away from the high density of the Puerto Rican population. But it is to say that the organizational arrangements over which they have direct control tend to place the NPRs in the top or ascendant positions. In brief, they favor NPR characteristics in their organization, in contrast with the student system.

We reviewed the friendship choices in terms of ethnicity in the section in which we discussed ethnicity. As we pointed out, the North American or the NPR sample indicated that they liked Puerto Ricans and the majority of the Puerto Ricans indicated that they liked North Americans, although two of the Puerto Ricans denied liking NPRs. All of the students had Puerto Rican friends and only one Puerto Rican had no North American friends, in this case a CPR. (See Ques. 12.1, 12.2, 13.1, and 13.2, Table 1) This suggests that among the students themselves, at least at the eighth grade level, there is an absence of strong animosity in the relationships between Puerto Ricans and the other ethnics that exist in the school. In other words, at that level the Puerto Rican students are experiencing a rather positive environment so far as their ethnicity is concerned.

One of the ways to examine the organization of the student system from the point of view of the students is to ask them about the most popular students and then ask them to describe the most popular students named in terms of key characteristics. The students gave us the most popular student in the school, in their grade and in their room. (See Ques. 44.1, 44.2, 44.3, Table 4) The choices were distributed almost equally among male and female in all categories. Regrettably, we did not allow the format of this questionnaire to let the students supply us with their own modeling of these names in terms of the characteristics. That is, if we had left them a blank space instead of lines in which to list the individuals, they may have given us, for example, a cluster of males and a cluster of females, showing sex as a distinctive feature. However, a line and the form of the question suggested some kind of serial listing and that is what they did. The most popular students in the school and in the grade were Puerto Rican, even according to the North Americans. But within the room, there was a slight shift in the direction of including NPRs on the part of the NPR part of the sample. There is no question that in the student system, the Puerto Ricans dominate the popularity domain.

In the school as a whole, the eighth grade dominates the popularity choices. This may, of course, be because we asked the eighth grade group to tell us who are the most popular in the school. But it may also be due to a well-established seniority system that always allocates the most prestigious position for the whole school to the top grade but also had popularity and other prestige rewards within grades. In the school as a whole the room number of the most popular group tended to be the top track of the eighth grade and particularly the top two tracks. Thus if one combined the top two classrooms and the special classroom one would account for over two-thirds of all the choices made. Thus the social organization of the teacher-dominated work system intersects with and seems to affect the student system. And while not always with complete consistency, the students in the lower tracks seem to agree with this rank ordering of the rooms with respect to the most popular people. (See Ques. 44.1, 44.1a, 44.1b, 44.1c, 44.2, 44.2c, and 44.3, Table 4)

Thus the popularity system appears to be equally distributed among male and female, dominated by Puerto Ricans, dominated by the top track classrooms in the eighth grade, and dominated by the eighth grade. The students gave us some idea of the qualities of the characteristics that led to the students' being the most popular in addition to the characteristics about which we asked them. One of the ways they put it was that the students held certain offices or were holders of offices in the extra-curricular activities. Those who are elected to these positions are the most popular. The other two key characteristics were being friendly and being a good student or being smart. But the modal characteristic appears to be that they are friendly. Friendliness, and one might say in more formal language, ability in interpersonal relationships is a key characteristic for receiving votes of confidence from one's fellow students in school systems. It is interesting to relate this positive characteristic to the discussion by the students of why they did not like some students in the school, recalling that the most frequently mentioned reason for not liking other students was that they were snobbish or stuck up. This is the students' opposite of friendliness.

On the other hand, being a good student and being smart does play a role in the cluster of characteristics that lead one to assign popularity to them, from the point of view of the students themselves. The Puerto Ricans tended to feel that certain students were popular because they worked hardest but the NPRs were divided in selecting this as a reason for being popular. Good behavior was said by approximately half of the students to explain popularity, but the other half denied that it explained the popularity. (See Ques. 4.51, 4.52, 4.53, Table 4)

When we asked the students whether the students were popular because they were athletes, an ethnic difference showed in the responses. The North American students predominantly (by 80%) felt that the students were popular because they were athletic. Three-quarters of the CPRs indicated that this was not a consideration and about 40% of the PRPRs indicated that it was not the reason for the popularity.[80] Generally the students did not feel certain students were popular because they were "the toughest" which is an understandable response given the relatively high frequency of girl respondents. Somewhat fewer than a third of the students felt that toughness was involved in a student's being popular.[81] There was a kind of tautological question that created strong ethnic difference. We asked whether certain students were popular because they were leaders and nearly 100% of the NPRs agreed that they were popular because they were leaders. In contrast, all except one of the Puerto Ricans indicated that being a leader was not the reason for the popular students being popular. This suggests that the high evaluation of leadership that tends to characterize student systems in North America and to be connected with the heavy emphasis on voluntary associations at junior high and high school level is not shared by Puerto Ricans to the same degree. This may be a key and pivotal value difference in youthful cohorts. It may play a part in differential participation in extracurricular activities by North Americans as compared with Puerto Rican students. We note the CPRs are not in an intermediate position on this value, but agree with the PRPRs. The absence of this distribution is interest-provoking, even though we do not at this time have an explanation for it.

Beauty or being good-looking, from the point of view of the North Americans, definitely does play a part in being chosen as the more popular. The CPRs are equally divided and the PRPRs that responded tend to be negative with respect to looks playing a role in being popular. Again we have one of those value dimensions that is important in North American student systems, particularly with respect to girls, but in part also with respect to boys.[82] In response to our own structured queries, then, it seems that from the Puerto Ricans' point of view, people are popular because they are smart, work hard and behave well. North Americans would concur to some degree about the smartness and the hard work, and a little bit more with respect to behavior. But the characteristics that they think are the most important are being an athlete, a leader, and being best looking. The Puerto Ricans on the other hand do not indicate that these are key characteristics of the most popular students. Being tough appears to play an important role in the male NPR sample's judgment of why a person, particularly a boy, would be popular. But it appears to play a lesser role in the opinions of the Puerto Ricans.[83] (See Ques. 45.1 - 45.7, Table 4)

The CPRs tend to be of the opinion that it is not true that the teachers like the popular students better than the other students; but both the NPRs and the PRPRs show a certain amount of uncertainty on this point. Forty percent of the NPRs say yes, the teachers do like these students better than the other students. From the student perspective then, there is some tendency to feel that the students who are popular in the student system are also popular with the teachers. But there is a good deal of uncertainty around this, and so this is not a clear-cut characteristic of the student organizational system or the cognitive mapping with respect to that organization. (See Ques. 46.0.0, Table 4)

Having discussed this student system from the point of view of the informal student system, it is now important to look at the student system from the point of view of an aspect of the formal system. Clearly, one of the units of the student system as well as of the teachers' system of social organization of the eighth grade, is the individual classroom. Thus, it is important to explore the students' view of themselves and other students vis-a-vis the classroom units. Slightly more than half the students felt that one room was better than the other room. Eighty percent of the PRPRs felt this way, which suggests that their perception of the system is that yes, indeed, some rooms are better than the others.[84] The CPRs tend in the direction of denying that one room is better than the other, and the NPRs are rather equally divided on the question. Thus, the clear result here is that the PRPRs definitely see that one room is regarded as better than the other. As to why one is better than the other, all of the PRPRs responding to the open-ended segment of the question mentioned behavior traits. Thus, from their point of view, one room is better than the other because of behavior. The North Americans tended to say one room's students are smarter than the others', a response consistent with their experience with homogeneous grouping. Behavior is also mentioned by the NPR sample. The CPRs just simply did not participate in the response to the open-end query about why one room is better than the other, because there were no "yes" responses from the CPRs that one room was better than another.

The students felt that the best rooms were the two top rooms, the two top track rooms. The very top room received the most votes, understandably the most votes from the NPRs, but a high rate of selections by the PRPRs. Sixty percent of the PRPRs cast their choices for the best room for one or the other of the top track rooms. The North Americans tended to mention other room numbers which may have been rooms of other grades but are not rooms in which eighth graders are located.[85] In their open-ended explanation for why they claimed one room was better than the other, the PRPRs favored the idea that the room had the best teacher or the students were more intelligent. The NPRs overwhelmingly explained their choice to be because the students were more intelligent. The CPRs divided their responses between behavior and intelligence, and the more frivolous idea that that room is the fun room.

The responses of the NPRs were a reflection of the structure of the system, as were the responses of the PRPRs from their point of view and their position within the structured overall social organization of the eighth grade. But this needs some elaboration.

As we have indicated, the lowest track group was publicly denigrated by other students and by teachers. The most denigrated group was taught by the most inexperienced teacher in the eighth grade. At the time we were observing the room, the research staff tended to assume the same sort of thing happened year after year with respect to the lowest track group. To check this proposition, we made the point of visiting the school and the classrooms the following year. At that time the teacher who had been teaching the top track room during our year's research in the school, and who was regarded by the majority of the students as the best teacher or an excellent teacher; and who, in the judgments of the teachers who talked to us, was regarded as among the best teachers, and who was apparently so regarded by the head office because the year preceding our research she had been labeled a master teacher, was teaching the lowest track. That same year the principal had tried to distribute "the behavior problems" more evenly among the various classrooms of the eighth grade. From three different observers who had worked the previous year in the school, reports came back in the field notes that there was little or no resemblance between the lowest track eighth grade of that year and the 302s. In discussing the lowest track group with other teachers as we went to their rooms and talked about what was happening with the eighth grade that year, there were quite positive reports about this group. Teachers reported that they were nice kids. One of the researchers explicitly interviewed this teacher about the contrast between that year's lowest group and the group of the previous year, 302. The teacher explained the difference in terms of her own ability to teach and her experience with organizing classrooms.

Thus we feel that the PRPR children who reported to us that the best teacher was a key feature of why one room was better than another struck directly at the heart of the basis for a classroom's reputation. We proposed that had the teacher been a higher status teacher, 302 would not have been talked about and denigrated so publicly in the way it was, since to do so would have been a clear assault on an experienced teacher's reputation.

We went on to ask students about their own grades and their own self-identity with respect to the grades. While nobody claimed that their own group was very poor at school work or at getting grades, the PRPRs indicated that their groups were not so good at grades and doing school work. The CPRs clustered very heavily in the middle range of claiming that their group was good at school work and grades, and the NPRs distributed themselves predominantly between very good and good ratings of their classmates at doing school work and getting good grades. (See Ques. 49 and 50, Table 4) Questions about their perception of whether their room was better in behavior provoked a more scattered response from the students. The PRPRs scattered their responses from "poor" to "better" but weighted in the direction of "poor;" the NPRs scattered theirs from "poor" to "better" but weighted in the direction of "better." And the CPRs were convinced that the behavior of their group was as good or better than the other groups. Having established their opinions of their own classrooms with respect to school work, grades, and behavior, we asked whether the student felt he/she was like the other students in their room. The NPRs predominantly felt they were like the other students in their rooms, despite the fact that there was a heavy proportion of Puerto Ricans in the room. The CPRs were equally divided; that is, half felt that they were like those in their room and half felt that they were not. Sixty percent of the PRPRs felt that they were not like the other students in their room, while 40% felt they were. Thus, more PRPRs tended to have negative feelings about their identity with the group; they also tended to rate them as poor in behavior and certainly as poor in school work and getting grades. These opinions appear to be related to the social structure of the eighth grade, and would lead one to expect the scores on the self-esteem inventory, particularly in the academic area would reflect these opinions. For the principal sample, we did find the expected relative position of the PRPRs. We will discuss this below.

Finally, we did an assessment of the overall opinion of the school, based on the valence of attitudinal tone of the students' response to a question about how their school compared with other schools. The Puerto Ricans tended to show positive attitudes toward their school in comparison with other schools, while the NPRs tended to show a negative evaluation of the school in comparison with the other schools. We suggest that this generally positive attitude on the part of the Puerto Ricans may have to do with the fact that their own ethnic group and culture dominates at least the student part of the system. (See Ques. 53, Table 4) Related to this attitude is perhaps the response of the NPRs to the notion about whether there is an advantage to being Puerto Rican in the school. They felt that there were advantages and in their open-ended explanations, nearly half of them said one gets beaten up less frequently if one is Puerto Rican. Thus, from their point of view, being Puerto Rican helps in the problem of avoiding harassment by other students. We have discussed under ethnicity the students' perception of the system as a whole, but it is clear that the students see the school as a mixed population of various nationalities. There are no strong and unbroachable hostilities between the Puerto Ricans and the NPRs from the Puerto Ricans' point of view and to nearly equal degree from the NPRs' point of view. The values of the student system are complementary to the idea that persons are most admired because they make good grades and work hard. To the great majority, grades are very important to these young people. The student system then is not a counter-culture system so far as we can tell from the responses from our principal sample. So far the emotional effects of participation in lower tracks on the part of Puerto Rican students, are not directed at ideological evaluations of the school and the teachers. There is some general evidence in the response that they are suffering from some problems of personal identity. We may expect some reflection of this in the self-esteem scores, perhaps not in the general scores since that also includes their relationship to their household and peers, but perhaps in the academic scores. That is, given the results that we found in the student sector and the predominance of the Puerto Ricans in that sector, one would not expect low self-esteem scores vis-a-vis peers on the part of the PRPRs despite the fact that they were having much experience with negativism toward the group with which they were associated for most of their time in school. It would be the subscore on their academic standing in which we would expect identity problems.

Other indications of the generally positive sentiment toward the school that we feel might well be attributed to the dominance of the Puerto Ricans of the student system and the generally non-hostile relationships that they seem to have established with the NPRs, are the fact that the students in great majority report that they do like the people that they go to school with, and that they feel they are treated the same as others by the rest of the students. (See Ques. 74 and 77, Table 5) On the other hand, we found that about a third of the CPRs reported not liking the people they go to school with. With a small sample it is difficult to speculate. An upwardly mobile group like most of the CPRs may tend to try to dissociate themselves from other Puerto Ricans. We picked up this response one or two times from one or two of the CPRs. This raises the question of how such attitudes might be reflected in their self-esteem scores, and this might be reflected in the subscore having to do with peers.

In our subsample the self-esteem inventories represent very small frequencies. But with that in mind, we note the average of the self-esteem scores is highest for the NPRs, next highest for CPRs, and lowest for PRPRs in all cases. (See the self-esteem scores at the end of Table 1). General self-esteem is not highly differentiated, since there is only five-tenths of a point difference between the NPRs and the CPRs. But the PRPRs, though few in number, are two score points below the NPRs, a little over one-and-a-half points below the CPRs, and approximately one-and-a-half points below the average for the total sample. With respect to the other subscores, the same rank order of distribution is obtained, but the spread of the scores is different. In peer subscores the CPRs may be suffering from the problems of being identified with lower-rated PRPRs and thus have somewhat less self-esteem with respect to their peers than might be expected otherwise. The self-esteem subscores on home and parents show an interesting clustering of the CPRs and PRPRs below the sample average, with the NPRs above the sample average. The CPRs and PRPRs are very close on this score, suggesting that the home-parent relationship is not affected in the same way that the other subscores are by the social structure and ideology of the school.

The school academic scores show the only exception to the rank-ordered pattern from NPR to CPR to PRPR. The CPRs rank higher than the NPRs; the PRPRs rank lowest. It is interesting to reflect on the self-esteem score in light of the report of the relative opinion of the NPRs as compared with the Puerto Ricans about the school and the neighborhood. In this instance it appears that the CPRs are happier with their school academic standing than are the NPRs. The PRPRs, though few in number, show a notably lower rating of themselves on the school academic scores, as we anticipated would be the case given their position in the school organization. Frankly, we feel that, if the lowest track of PRPRs had been included in this particular subscore, the ratings would have been equally as low if not lower.[86]

The results of the self-esteem scores that were done by 1970 indicate that there was a tendency for the NPRs to show a rise in the self-esteem scores in all except the home-parent subscores. The CPRs tended to stay the same or to drop in score levels. The literature on self-esteem, of course, is mixed. In the face of this mixed literature, it is foolhardy to base conclusions of any definiteness on such small frequencies. We would venture to suggest that self-esteem is not a generalized phenomenon, but is situationally specific. And that social phenomenon, such as events at ethnic interfaces and ethnic encounters, affect the subscores that pertain to the specific kinds of activities involved at the point of contact in the situations where contact occurs. In this instance we have contact in the school-academic area between a North American-dominated school professional system and a Puerto Rican population, and the academic self-esteem score reflects that. On the other hand, the peer scores are given in a situation where the Puerto Ricans are generally dominant by their numbers with the CPRs the most popular in the system and the NPRs located in the classrooms from which the popular students are selected.

We might also anticipate that, with the conflict between the assimilation of the CPR girls to the North American cultural pattern of adolescence, and the conflict this creates with the home and parents, CPR girls would show a significant drop in self-esteem scores, with respect to parents, during this period of conflict. That is, as the specific conditions of the situation to which the subscores are related change, one will get a change in the self-esteem subscores. In sum, despite the fact that the Puerto Ricans dominate the student system, the general assessment is that the NPRs are not suffering seriously from being in the minority in this school. One might properly wonder if this would be equally the case if the Puerto Ricans were of a similar fractional minority in a school dominated either by North American white ethnics or blacks. One suspects not. But one must take into consideration the fact that teachers favor North American features. The school organization over which they have control favors North American characteristics, and following North American values helps increase the relative position of the NPR minority, despite the fact that it is small in relative numbers.

Students' views on school and home. The students' perception of the relationship of the parents to the school is an important aspect of the way they see the school. We asked them to report to us their own views of how often their parents went to school for any reason. The modal response was that the parents seldom go to school. The next most frequent response was that the parents never visit the school. Two of the Puerto Rican youths reported that their parents visit the school often (See Ques. 40, Table 4) Thus, their notion of the relationship of the parents to the school is that their parents do not have that much to do with school. This raises the question of how the students view the reasons for their parents' coming. The question about whether they come because of behavior problems received a generally negative response, except for one NPR and one CPR. (See Ques. 41.1, Table 4) Forty percent of the PRPRs reported that their parents came to school to keep up with what goes on in school. In the students' minds programs and special events do not bring their parents or adults from the house to the school. Only the NPRs and CPRs indicate a positive response to the idea that parents come to see programs and special events. None of the PRPR students see their parents as coming for these reasons.

From the students' point of view, the thing that brings their parents to the school most often is a request from the teacher or the principal. Half of the students feel that that is the reason their parents go to school. (See Ques. 41.1, Table 4)

Our inferences from the Puerto Rican pattern that assigns major responsibility to the mother for upbringing of the child, along with the fact that the fathers work, would lead us to predict that it is usually the mother who comes to the school. That seems very much to be the case for the North American sample, but the form of the question allowed the students to check the frequency with which either parent, or someone else comes in terms of usually, seldom, or never. And the modal response for each of these entries is that neither mother nor father comes to school. On the question of whether the father goes, 50% of the CPRs report that their father does go to school, suggesting that school is a serious enough business in those families to bring about the visit of the father. At the same time, 50% of the CPRs report that the mother never comes to school and 50% report that the father never comes to school. It is clear that for all three subgroups, parents, mothers and fathers, almost never come together to the school. These responses were given of course before graduation, which is perhaps the one occasion on which mothers and fathers would come together if they were to come to an event.

The overall picture of the relationship of the parents to the school from the students' point of view is that they are not very involved with the school. The teachers' ideology would suggest to us that they are not very involved because they are not concerned. The students' responses do not assist us in making a judgment either pro or con about that that teachers' perspective. Yet the decided interest of the students in school despite a general belief of the teachers to the contrary, and the evidence from our own parents' expression of interest in education, suggests that the lack of involvement of the parents in the school may rest in other areas.

A great many studies recently have suggested that the home background of the students explains a great deal about what happens to them in school. Our overall approach to this question, of course, is that its explanatory power rests on the complementarity of home with the school, or in the negative direction, because of antinomy or conflict between home and what goes on in the school. But one of the areas that might be explored in order to understand how homes involve themselves in the ideology of the teacher and school is to find out what happens with the students doing work, the proverbial homework, in the home. From their responses PRPRs obviously do school assignments at home during weekday evenings, but it is not so clear whether they do them on weekends. Perhaps the format of the question confused them. The response from the CPRs was not to respond to the question, which raises a problem with its interpretation, of course. One of the things one must keep in mind in assessing the students' responses to these questions is that some of the teachers deliberately do not assign homework. In one interview, the teacher explained at length that she did not assign homework because she felt that the home life of the students was not conducive to doing homework at home, and consequently she provided time and encouraged the students to do their work in the school. All of the Puerto Rican students in her classroom were CPRs, and this may explain why only one of the CPRs indicates that he always does his homework or school assignments at home. (See Ques. 86.1, Table 6) Contrary to the teachers' stereotype of the students' homes, 50% of the PRPRs report that they have a room to themselves at home. Fifty percent report that they do not. Among CPRs, fewer report having rooms to themselves and indeed, the NPRs less frequently report having rooms of their own. Having a room to oneself might have been differently interpreted by PRPRs than by the others. The rooms are usually shared with siblings, but the PRPRs' replies are contrary to the notion that they are beset with the problem of having no space of their own in their own home. (See Ques. 87.2, Table 4) At least their own perception is that they do have the space. Their perception of this space may not coincide with a teacher's view of the kind of space in which a student can do isolated intellectual school work. (See Ques. 87.0, Table 4). The important question with respect to space is where one studies and the conditions there. Among our students who responded, the living room is not only the place where they study, but is the preferred study place. The kitchen and the dining room are also mentioned as places where the youths study. The preferred place of the CPRs is their own room, although they more often report that they do not have that. A number of the students, particularly the NPRs and the PRPRs, indicate that they prefer to do their homework in school. (See Ques. 88.1 and 88.2, Table 6)

Since many of them do their school work in a rather public part of their home, the conditions in those areas are important. These students tend to have the radio playing while they are studying. But half the sample report that they do not have the television set playing while they are studying, and this is consistent across both groups with respect both to radio playing and television playing. (See Ques. 88.3, 88.3a, and 88.3b, Table 6) However, despite the fact that the radio is playing, the Puerto Ricans tend to report that they do not listen to the radio while they are studying. On the other hand, the NPRs report that they usually do listen to the radio while they are studying. Again this may be a contrasting cultural pattern in which the habit of playing the radio and listening to it while one is studying is fairly North American, but there is a tendency for the Puerto Ricans to exclude the radio while studying. That is, the two activities, working at studies and listening to the radio are separated in time by Puerto Ricans. But this is sheer speculation, and a few of the Puerto Ricans report listening to the radio.

Watching television is perhaps a more distracting sort of activity while one is studying, but all of the NPRs report that they watched television while studying. Half of the responding CPRs report that they do not watch television while studying. Half of the PRPRs say they do and half say they do not. The general picture then, is that the NPRs spend a rather noisy time while studying and the Puerto Ricans are equally divided between a more or less noisy ambiance while they are studying, usually, as we have already said, in a more public part of the household such as in the dining room and kitchen.

Since they all are doing studies in these areas one might ask what is the response of the family if the noise from radio or television becomes troublesome. Thus, some gauge of the significance attributed to studying and school work could perhaps be derived from the students' report about whether they ever ask the femily to turn down the television set. The NPRs reported that, indeed, all of them had at some time asked the family to turn down or turn off the television set. (See Ques. 91.1, Table 6) The Puerto Ricans, both CPRs and PRPRs were equally divided in their response. This means that Puerto Rican youngsters may not feel that they can ask the family to turn down or turn off the television set. However, we cannot assign that interpretation to the response as it stands, simply because it may be they do not care to have it turned down or turned off. The question of whether the family complies indicates that for the NPR sample, about two-thirds report that their families ignore them. Half of the responding PRPRs indicate that their families do respond to them as do the CPRs. Consequently at least in reports of compliance, the Puerto Rican families are as accommodating from the youths' point of view as are the NPR families.

Turning from television sets to the general question of noise, we asked whether the youths had ever requested that somebody in the family be quiet while they studied. Most of the NPRs reported that they had made these requests, but half of the PRPRs indicated that they had never made such requests and half of the responding CPRs indicated that they had never made that request. The response, then, suggests that requesting that people be quiet while one studies is not a dominant theme of doing homework at home for Puerto Ricans. But it is certainly an idea that is present and suggests a home setting for half the families that is environmentally supportive of school-related activity in the home. It should be recalled that we have suggested in other places that the bias of the NPR sample in this case is toward working-class ideology with respect to education, a segment of the population that would perhaps regard the television set as equally important with the school work of the children in the household. But it does counter the overgeneralizing tendency to see the Puerto Ricans as less concerned with education than all North Americans. In many instances comparisons have been selective, the person in question comparing ethnic groups in the U.S. that place strong emphasis on intellectual academic kinds of development with the whole of the Puerto Rican population whether it is middle class or recently arrived immigrants searching for a better job possibility.

There is indication of a marked degree of interest in homework in response to the question of whether anybody in the family ever asks about homework. (See Ques. 93, Table 6) Thus over 70% of the responding students indicate that someone in the home does ask them about homework and this includes two-thirds of the PRPRs, all of the NPRs, and nearly two-thirds of the CPRs. In these families generally the mother is the one who asks, but in some cases the students report that both the mother and father ask. (See Ques. 93.2, Table 6) And these queries, according to the students, usually happen after school, although a few disgruntled students simply reported that they were being asked about this all the time.

The next domain about which one might ask is the interest that the students see expressed in the grades they receive for the work they do. The students do compare their report cards with others. A high frequency of the CPRs report comparing with siblings. This response warns us not to overlook the sibling sector of the family as a key element in the supportive environment for school work, particularly in Puerto Rican families. In extended families this could conceivably have as much significance as parental support. (See Ques. 95.2, Table 6)

Contrary to the teachers' views, all the PRPRs report that there is somebody who asks about their grades. A smaller portion of the CPRs so report and two-thirds of the NPRs report that somebody asks them about the grades on their report cards. In response to the question of who asks, it is clear among the NPRs that the parents are the dominant ones, but the Puerto Ricans give a range of responses that indicate that parents, siblings, and friends all are among those who ask about grades on their report cards. Thus, the range of types of people who may express interest is broader for the Puerto Ricans. This may, of course, be simply a function of the composition of households rather than the simple fact of broader interest in grades on report cards among the Puerto Ricans than among the NPRs. (See Ques. 96.2, Table 6)

In middle and upper class homes it is quite common for the children to receive instruction outside the context of the school. We wanted to get a picture of whether this existed in our sample population, so we asked them about instruction or lessons outside the school, and even included Sunday school in our illustrations. Nearly 90% indicated they received no such instruction outside the school. One PRPR and one NPR indicated they did receive some instruction outside the school, but this appears to be very uncommon for this population. We went further along this train of thought, attempting to explore another facet of the question of education outside the school. Since learning to play a musical instrument is presumably a common experience among modern youth, and in a great many cases is a kind of formalized instruction received outside the school, we asked our sample whether they played musical instruments. Only four of our sample played musical instruments. A little over two-thirds knew no such skill. Thus, from the information we gathered from both of these questions, we can speculate with some degree of assurance that formally delivered instruction for this population seems to be confined mainly to the school. Or one might put it in emic cognitive terms and say that instruction received outside the shcool is not perceived as instruction, since there is a possibility of a difference in the way the youths map the phenomena of formalized transmittal of information from one individual to another who has as his purpose the instruction of another. Thus, their concept of the nature of learning is based mainly on the school setting and is not compared with other types of instruction that produce skill or knowledge outcomes but take place outside of the context of the school.

It is, perhaps, easy to blame home conditions as the key to school problems. In the teachers' educational ideology, home conditions are connected to their definition of the basic problem being lack of motivation. Our reading is that theirs is an inaccurate and stereotyped assessment of the true condition of Puerto Ricans' motivation. We would attribute to both the NPR and the Puerto Rican families a generally moderately high level of motivation with respect to all the detailed supportive acts to scholarship. Thus, the teachers were actually working with moderately high supportive levels of motivation in a difficult environment, but they are not working with low levels, or with no motivation. The general picture that one derives from the students' responses to queries about support of school activity in the home is that there is genuine support across the board for school work being done in the home. That is, it is not as negative as one might derive from listening only to the teachers. On the other hand, it is clear that the intellectual scholar is not the signal value in most of the homes. Of course, with the small size of the sample, one must make this judgment with caution on the basis of the responses reviewed here. However, our own participation in the households indicates that this is a fair assessment of what is in fact the case. There is general support for school work activity in the household. The teachers may feel that the home environments do not support isolated concentration for long periods and they are in part accurate in this. Here we do not, of course, compare upper-middle class homes with the economically poorer homes of our Puerto Rican sample. We are comparing with a NPR population of youths that come from a similar modest economic milieu. Thus, we find that the Puerto Ricans, who themselves are from moderate- to low-income families, have an equally strong expression of positive support for education and are equally strong on their educational ideology as NPRs of similar economic background. Our conclusion, then, is that for the group there are no more problems with motivation on the part of students, on the part of parents, or with the conditions for performing school work in the home for the Puerto Ricans than for NPR families of the same socio-economic background. We are convinced that the greater degree and frequency of problems in education for PRPRs and for CPRs lie elsewhere than with lack of interest and motivation.

Educational ideology of parents. We have already talked about some of the common ideas that teachers attribute to parents of the children they teach. The teachers have views that are often based on very little direct observation and very little information. Additional information may or may not change views and basic assumptions, of course. But, in so far as the school's policies are based on these views, the question of how well the teachers' views reflect the actual views and sentiments of parents is an important issue. Thus, we have used the sample youths' parents to explore the ideological and evaluative system of parents toward the school. We have been particularly interested in the Puerto Rican parents' view, but we used the NPR parental group as a comparison in order to test the tendency to attribute certain views mainly to Puerto Rican ethnics. Thus, if we find our NPR parents have ideas in substantial agreement with the CPR and PRPR parents, then it is clearly inappropriate to describe a particular belief or view as being characteristic of Puerto Ricans. On the contrary, it should be attributed to the parental population of the school in general. The comparisons between the NPR parents and the Puerto Rican parents have uncovered some surprising differences and some surprising commonalities. We will point these out specifically in the course of the following discussion.

One of the important considerations in a mixed ethnic environment is the question of getting along. We wondered what the parents' view of these relationships might be, and more specifically, where they felt responsibility lies in teaching children to "get along with others." The Puerto Ricans strongly adhere to the idea that both the home and the school are responsible for teaching children what might be called rules of behavior for getting along with others. In contrast, the NPR portion of the sample suggested that these things should be taught at school. (See Ques. 9.0.0a, Table 9) There is clearly a significant difference between the position of the North American NPR parents and the Puerto Rican parents, both CPRs and PRPRs on this question. We found further that the Puerto Rican parents had many suggestions to offer as to how these skills and perspectives might be taught but, consistent with their attitude that the school should do it, the NPRs had very little to suggest by way of means of teaching children to get along with one another. Puerto Rican parents, on the other hand, suggested means ranging from modeling by parents and teachers to special programs and having children work together, to giving advice (a procedure favored by the CPRs) and finally discipline and correction of behavior (a procedure favored by the PRPRs). A difference in emphasis showed up between the CPRs and the PRPRs, the latter favoring discipline correction and modeling, the CPRs seeming to favor special programs and giving advice.[87] (See Ques. 9.0.0b, Table 9) About 40% of the North Americans felt that teaching to get along with adults was mainly the responsibility of the home, and another mentioned home and school. (See Ques. 11.0.0a, Table 9) The Puerto Rican parents have definite ideas on why children should be taught to get along with adults, having the view that it is preparation for the good life. The PRPRs were particularly concerned that the child learn to respect the teacher and emphasized that when they thought about teaching children to get along with adults, that is the thing they thought about. The NPRs did not discuss why this was important except one who related that teaching children to get along with adults meant teaching them to listen to their parents. There may be an ethnic difference operating in terms of the perspectives on the social functions of teaching children to get along with adults. For the Puerto Ricans, it has to do with being well-educated in the Puerto Rican sense, a concept that might well be discussed here.

To be educated, tener educación, means to be well-bred or to have good manners in the more modern sense in Puerto Rico. Thus, it refers to behavior and being taught proper behavior. The concept that matches the North American notion of being educated in the sense of having knowledge is instruído, and even more precisely, the notion of instrucción. The point of this semantic exercise is that within the lexemes of Puerto Rican conversation is a way of distinguishing being educated behaviorally and being educated intellectually. And we feel that the behavioral emphasis is very strongly reflected in the responses of the Puerto Ricans, both CPRs and PRPRs. While the direction of opinion is not so weighted in one direction on the question of who is the more important of the two, home or school, the CPRs and PRPRs tend to favor the notion that both home and school are equally important, although a third and more of the PRPRs and CPRs indicate that home is more important. The NPRs apparently feel to some degree that the home is more important in teaching children to get along with adults. Nevertheless, the weight of opinion seems to be that this is a cooperative matter of the school and the home. The responses of the Puerto Ricans reflect the kind of emphasis on behavior that one finds typical in conversations with Puerto Rican parents. Their readiness in responding to this question also suggests that it has a great deal of meaning for them, whereas with the NPR parents one feels the emphasis on behavioral training is not part of what they focus on when they think of school and teaching.

One might speculate that, in relating to adults, youths' behavior might be somewhat different in the home than in the school. This could be due to the fact that the code governing social relationships is different in the home and in the school, or put in more common sociological language, the role relationships are different in the home than in the school. On the other hand, there is a good deal of ideology that suggests that the teachers may be like second parents. In the open-ended interviews this kind of phraseology was used by the Puerto Rican parents in describing what they felt should be the relationships between their own children and the teacher. One way to clarify the parents' views on this point is to ask them whether they felt that their teenager's behavior differs in the school and in the home. And their responses reflected the reality of opting for one or the other alternatives depending on one's point of view. At least the Puerto Ricans seemed equally divided on the question. The North Americans rather strongly (80%) argued that there were behavioral differences in the youths between home and school. (See Ques. 20.0.0, Table 9) We found that those who think there is a difference think that the children are more obedient at school than they are at home. This perspective does not fit with the teachers' observation that if they are not obedient at home they are not obedient at school or vice versa if they are obedient at home then they are obedient at school. About half of the parent sample indicates that there is about the same behavior in school and in home and in this respect agrees with the teacher. But the other half definitely has the attitude that the students behave better at school than at home. And on further questioning on this point with regard to being respectful, the slight majority of all of the subgroups felt that the children were more respectful in school than at home. The others felt, of course, that they were about the same in the home and in the school. None chose the alternative of suggesting that the youths were more respectful at home than at school. There is a slight majority of the group, 60%, in favor of youths being more respectful in school than at home, versus 40% that say it is the same. Thus it is not a question on which there is a strong polarization, and understandably, one can argue questions from several points of view. These views on behavior at home and at school are related to the question of whether certain specific relationships, such as father-son and male teacher-male student, are thought appropriately to be the same or similar. Thus, from the responses to this question one might anticipate that at least half of the parents think respect and obedience behavior of the youths vis-a-vis teachers and parents is to be similarly "coded" and guided by similar rules.

One other aspect of this is the idea that there may be differences between boys and girls. The Puerto Ricans, both CPRs and PRPRs, were overwhelmingly in favor of the view that there is no difference in this matter between boys and girls. The NPRs were equally divided on the question. There appears to be a difference in the point of view of the two ethnic groups on the behavior of male and female youths vis-a-vis adults. That is, the NPRs tend to feel there is differentiation between boy and girl behavior on questions of respect, but the Puerto Ricans feel that there should be no difference between boys and girls in terms of respecting adults. This result is rather surprising in light of all the literature on male dominance in Latin culture and the widespread literature on machismo. It may come as a surprise to those who look to socialization as a basis for the contrastive feminine-masculine patterns, that a sample of North American parents sees reason for greater difference between the behavior of boys and girls with respect to adults than does a Puerto Rican sample. Moreover, the Puerto Rican sample is divided between recent arrivals and those who have been in the States for 15 to 20 years, suggesting that whatever effects have occurred in changes of opinion and value systems among the CPRs, the view that girls and boys should be equally respectful toward adults has not changed. We feel that this is an unexpected finding and bears further study in terms of a better understanding of male-female socialization in a Latin culture. A great many inferences have been drawn from the adult Latin machismo behavior and much of what is claimed about male-female role development may be inference from an adult relationship and may, indeed, not hold in socialization processes as completely and totally as had sometimes been claimed to be the case.

We found that parents had some definite views on who does the disciplining of boys in the school and who should do it. The NPR sample seems to be more aware of the actual structure of discipline and punishment in the school and more frequently mentioned the principal as a disciplinarian. The Puerto Ricans, however, strongly favored the idea that the teacher should discipline the boy when he misbehaves. A supportive minority of around 37.5% of the CPRs felt it should be a combination of teacher and parent. There were no such suggestions from the PRPRs nor from the NPRs. This suggested the CPRs felt that there should be rather strong concern on the part of the parents for handling part of the discipline of the student. What they had in mind, judging from their interviews, was that the teachers and parents should counsel the student; but when it came to punishment, it is the parents who should do the punishing. Now their view on what actually happens suggests that they find that the teacher generally does the disciplining and the responses of the CPRs suggest that some of those parents feel that disciplining is neglected--that no one seems to discipline the boys in the school, neither teacher nor principal. This reflects a minority theme that occurs in the interviews with the parents, that the school and the teacher and the principal do not demand respectful behavior from their children while they are in school. (See Ques. 22.0.0a and 22.0.0b, Table 9)

Among their discussions of these questions the parents sometimes mentioned the form of discipline that they think should take place, and the NPRs seem to favor forms of threatening to tell the parents, and taking away privileges. But the Puerto Ricans talked about more direct methods such as talking to the students and actual corporal punishment. The North Americans felt that generally, boys were disciplined by having their privileges taken away or being threatened with notes or reports to their parents. The Puerto Ricans, mainly the PRPRs, felt that corporal punishment was the main way that the school disciplined the boys. This perspective on the part of the PRPRs may, of course, reflect a reality that is particular to the Puerto Rican boys who are recent arrivals. Consider the problem of the communication of discipline to boys who do not speak English with fluency. It may well be a circumstance under which the adults in the school resort to corporal punishment, and the parents' views on what actually happens reflect this. The CPRs tended not to discuss this question, but those who did followed the pattern that had been noted earlier of talking about a combination of corporal punishment and verbal correction. (See Ques. 22.0.0d, Table 9)

With respect to girls, the parents of the Puerto Rican children suggested that the preferred disciplinary agent most frequently mentioned was the teacher or combination of teacher, parent, and principal. They did not recommend the principal as the disciplinarian very often. In some contrast the NPR sample emphasized the teacher and the principal equally often. Thus, for the North American portion of the sample, the principal is seen to play a major role in discipline; but among the Puerto Ricans the tendency is to view the teacher as the key disciplinarian. At least that is what they tend to prefer. Again, one gets the response of the CPR parents that nobody seems to do any disciplining. No one mentioned the parent as the actual disciplinary agent to the girls. The Puerto Rican parents again express the preference for a combination of talk and corporal punishment for disciplining girls and the North Americans mentioned the treat to tell the parents and the removal of privileges as their idea of how girls should be disciplined. And, just as for the boys, the PRPRs tend to view the actual situation to be that the girls receive corporal punishment for infractions in the school and the CPRs tend to move slightly in the direction of the NPRs, emphasizing removal of privileges and threats to tell the parent. (See Ques. 22.0.0g and 22.0.0h, Table 9) In brief, the parents' point of view about disciplining the students for correction of behavior suggests that the Puerto Ricans tend to see the teacher as the key disciplinarian and to view talking and corporal punishment as the preferred means and the actual means; while the North Americans mentioned the principal as the disciplinarian more often and prefer that discipline be delivered by removing privileges and threatening to tell a parent.

While parents are not supposed to be professionals as far as teaching is concerned, they do have views about how rewards should be administered for work done. In their views on the offering of rewards there is an interesting unusual pattern of response. The question asked about when a child should be rewarded; while he was doing something or after he had finished. The North Americans were clearly very much in favor of his being rewarded after he had finished and the PRPRs also favored that procedure on the part of the teacher. But all of the CPRs favored rewarding the student while he was doing something, whether or not the teacher rewarded him after he had done it. (See Ques. 23.0.0, Table 9) Why the CPRs should feel so strongly about rewards in the course of carrying out a task is an interesting fact to be explained. It should be remembered that of the three subgroups, the CPRs are probably the strongest upwardly mobile group. Thus, it may even be the case that they do not want to leave to chance the possibility that their children will not do something well or properly. Thus, their approach to reward is to use it to structure the instructional situation in a definite manner.[88] The contrastive opinion of the CPRs should be further explored in subsequent research.

In comparing the relative importance of grades and behavior, two-thirds of the total sample indicated that both grades and behavior were important. But the CPRs again showed a slightly different distribution. For the PRPRs, a little over 70%, and for the NPRs, 80%, indicated that both were important. About 50% of the CPRs mentioned both but somewhat over one-third of the CPRs claimed that grades were more important. The responses here are related to an earlier discussion above regarding the Puerto Rican concept of "educated." That is, their view of education includes both being well-educated with respect to behavior and manners and with respect to being well-informed. The fact that one of the Puerto Ricans even claimed behavior was more important than grades suggests that the PRPRs are being consistent with this view in that none suggested that grades are more important than behavior. On the other hand, the North American sample also attributes equal importance to behavior and grades by a good sized majority. In the subsequent discussion of why parents are called to school or go to school, we will find that the North Americans are very conscious of going to school because the teacher or the principal asks them to go for behavioral reasons. The NPRs have behavior as a focal phenomenon that is likely to lead to the rather unhappy experience of going to school to see about the improper behavior of their children. Fifty percent of the CPRs agree that behavior and grades are equally important, whether because of the unhappy reasons for going to school for behavioral infractions or because of the Puerto Rican tradition, it might be hard to tell. But it is interesting that 37.5% of the CPRs, despite these possible two strong reinforcing reasons for claiming that both grades and behavior are important, insist that grades are important, and more important than behavior. Again it may reflect their higher achievement motivations for their children. We think this is one more instance to underline the view that in our sample we have tapped two significantly different populations of Puerto Ricans. That is not to say that the recent arrivals from Puerto Rico, after a period of time, might not themselves become part of the CPR type population, but we feel that the populations are significantly different and that it warrants the consideration of differing treatment and differing programs for the two populations. Moreover, we feel that while there have been arguments in favor of the fact that the Puerto Ricans on the mainland are not all of one class, this is the first research project that has tapped that significant difference in the form of expression of differing ideas, values, and approaches to the very important domains of education and occupation. (See Ques. 44.0.0, Table 9)

The question of the parent-teacher relationships is an important one and one that we explored with the parents. In general, it could be said that the Puerto Rican parents, particularly the recent arrivals, referred often to the necessity of parent and teacher knowing one another as being the basis for good relationships. It should be noted that our PRPR sample tended to come from smaller towns or rural areas, and not from urban areas of Puerto Rico. The observations of the director of this project in an earlier study in Puerto Rico indicated that a great deal of the communication and coordination between parents and teachers and teachers and parents in Puerto Rico took place, not in formal settings of public meetings, but in interpersonal relationships around the town and in contacts in the stores and houses and the countryside. Thus, many of the Puerto Rican parents had an experience and a tradition of informal influence and informal coordination with teachers in the school. Thus, it is interesting to explore the views of these parents regarding parent-teacher relationships in the U.S. urban situation; what the parents feel the relationships should be and how they should be maintained. In their discussion and description of relationships that existed between parents and teachers in the Division Street setting, the responses of 60% or a little over of the CPR and of the NPR parents, either directly or indirectly indicated that, in their judgment, the parent-teacher relationships were rather good. The PRPRs, however, showed slightly less than 60% who felt that relationships were acceptable, suggesting that they were saying, in a polite way, that parent-teacher relationships could have been improved. Two Puerto Ricans, one CPR and one PRPR, definitely felt that the relationships were bad. None of the North American parents felt that the parent-teacher relationships were bad. With the pattern of response in mind of the NPRs feeling that the relationships were good to acceptable, the CPR parents sharing an equal opinion, with one exception, and with the PRPRs weighted in the direction of acceptable, but not good, we can assess the particulars of when and under what conditions parents come in contact with school personnel. (See Ques. 18.0.0a, Table 9)

In expressing views on whether parents do indeed visit school, the CPRs again show a somewhat different pattern of answer as compared with the other two groups. From the view of PRPRs, 100% think that parents indeed do visit school. About 80% of the NPRs and only half of the CPRs feel parents do visit the school. About a third of the CPRs feel negative or uncertain about whether parents do indeed visit the school. The PRPRs' view then, is in rather sharp contrast to the teachers' view that the parents of recent arrivals do not visit the school. Teachers are very impatient with what they feel is a lack of sufficient interest in education to come to the school and communicate with the teacher. It may be recalled that two of the male teachers admitted that they knew very little about the parents because the parents did not come very often. That is not a view shared by the PRPRs, nor does it seem a view shared by the North American portion of the sample, although the teachers do not complain as much about the NPRs. While it was not reflected in the details of the interviews, in our participant observer roles we collected information from the principal and some of the teachers indicating that they regarded the NPRs as the mainstay of the organized effort for PTA and other active parental participation in school.

The earlier response with regard to behavior and grades may well be related to the response to the question of why parents go to school. Again on this question the CPRs differentiated from the PRPRs and the North American sample.[89] The North American sample and the PRPR sample indicate that parents go because a letter arrives from the teacher or principal saying they should go, or one goes for special programs and presentations and meetings. None of the CPRs refer to the letters requesting their presence at the school. In contrast, they mention with moderate frequency the middle ground of special programs and meetings, but most often emphasize going themselves to check on the child's progress and conduct. Thus, we find that the parents of the NPRs and of the recent arrivals emphasizing visits to school in response to notes that usually signal trouble and misbehavior on the part of the student. But the CPRs emphasize their own active initiative in going to check on their child's progress as well as conduct. Again, this reflects the real possibility of much stronger achievement motivation on the part of the CPRs. (See Ques. 18.0.0d, Table 9)

The CPRS and the PRPRs tend to see the mode of communication between teachers and parents differently than do the NPRs. The NPRs tend to see themselves as being communicated with by the teachers through report cards and special programs. The PRPRs see themselves being communicated with mainly via notes and letters. The CPRs see themselves being communicated with via notes and letters and report cards. One PRPR, but none of the CPRs or the NPRs, mentioned the children's papers and work. The low frequency of mention of the examples of the children's work as a way in which teachers keep parents informed about children's progress is very interesting in light of all the paper that goes home from the school to the homes on which the daily grades and the daily work of the children appear, yet the parents do not perceive this as communication. On the other hand, another observation that one can make about this is that on first arriving, the Puerto Rican parents simply do not see the report cards as an important means of communicating to them what is happening with their youngsters in school. This is significant in that it is clearly in contrast to the teachers' perception of the report card as being the most important mode of communicating to parents about the children's progress. It will be recalled that in discussing the teachers' educational ideology regarding the parents' views of things, they were severely critical of the Puerto Rican parents for not carefully examining the report cards and signing them. On the other hand, in our account of the students' perception of what takes place with respect to report cards, we found they see their parents as looking at them and examining them. This suggests that we have three different sets of people who are engaged in the communication network and yet have very different ideas of what takes place. The teachers' view that the parents do not regard the report cards as significant modes of communication is true; but the parents do not see report cards as being as important as notes and letters, a more particularized and personalized kind of communication. This is particularly true of PRPR parents. Likely the notes and letters are written in Spanish and perhaps this makes a difference, although it may simply be that report cards are not regarded as a key communication mode by recently arrived Puerto Ricans. The CPRs have begun to accept report cards as important modes of communication between themselves and the school, but still regard the notes and letters as equally important. The NPRs show strong consistency, we would say cultural complementarity, with the pattern employed by the school of communicating with the parents in two major modes, particularly communicating positive perspectives or positive information, and that is through the open house or special programs and through report cards. In response to the question about how communication should take place, the NPRs clearly favor parental visits and special programs and PTA meetings, as do half of the CPRs, but the PRPRs who responded favor the notes and letters mode. The one "other" response is from a Puerto Rican father who emphasized the desirability of the teacher and the parents knowing one another, reflecting the idea that personal relationships could be important. We found that the Puerto Ricans had other ways to suggest that communication might take place. A number of the Puerto Ricans mentioned teacher visits to the home and communication by telephone. All of these suggestions reflect the Puerto Ricans' desire for more personal and individualized contacts rather than the impersonal modes, such as report cards, preferred by the school.

The parents' experiences with teachers in the school when they do go appear to be relatively good ones. Only a minority report bad experiences, but there are some from each of the subgroups who do report a bad experience with teachers at the school. (See Ques. 19.0.0, Table 9) The parents often go to school when a note is sent to them to come. They receive notes to come in the case of wrongdoing, such as absenteeism, fighting, or, using a Puerto Rican way of expressing the difficulty, of lacking respect, (falta respeto).[90] The CPRs strongly emphasized that one should appear at school immediately after being notified of some such behavioral problem. (See Ques. 24.0.0a and 24.0.0b, Table 9) The parents want to know immediately when a child does something bad. There is an interesting difference of the conceptualization of who contacts them to go to school regarding a child's misbehavior. The North Americans see mainly the principal and teacher as responsible for notifying the parents, but the CPRs have a very definite idea that the adjustment office personnel, which in our observation often is the case, notify the parents. The rest seem to be clear about where the notification comes from, with the CPRs the clearest of all. In their conceptualization of what happens when a parent visits the school, the NPR sample tends to emphasize teacher and principal as the people they talk to, the CPRs emphasize the principal and the adjustment office personnel, and the PRPRs mention all three. It is genuinely surprising that the PRPRs do not mention the adjustment office more often because it is in the adjustment office that the bilingual personnel are available for interpretation. But it is possible that they do not conceptualize the adjustment office personnel as anything other than interpreters. That is, they are not fully aware of the fact that it is a separate office set aside for personnel that is specializing in behavior as well as in the whole testing apparatus of the school. While the North Americans emphasize the fact that they should talk to all three, child, principal, and teacher, the CPRs are very definitely ready to focus on being sure that they talk to the teacher; and the PRPRs mentioned the principal as their preferred contact or perhaps a contact they do not want to miss. (See Ques. 26.0.0a and 26.0.0b, Table 9)

In order to investigate the possibility of a differing pattern in North American schools from the pattern observed in a Puerto Rican school by the director of the project, the parents' views of the course of the event on being called to school was explored. In Puerto Rico this pattern consisted of the sending of a note by the principal, usually to a parent; the parent appearing at the school and going into the office with the principal to talk with the principal alone, often while the student in question waited in the outer office; the student being brought in, the teacher sent for, and the group discussing the problem together. Sometimes the principal would talk with the parent and the student after the teacher had gone back to his or her classroom. One of the significant points was that the parent and the principal got together over the behavior problem prior to the direct confrontation with the youngster. In the Chicago situation the actual scene involved the principal with the parent and the child. Sometimes the teacher came in later, but sometimes the teacher appeared right away and there was a confrontation among all parties concerned immediately. The key difference in the two patterns is the occasion for the principal and the parent in Puerto Rico to get together to talk over the issues of morality and behavior code in the absence of the student and the teacher. Usually this did not take place in the North American setting. There was strong agreement among our respondents that the child should be present, but there was a small minority of CPRs and PRPRs who felt that the child should not be present. We have picked up in this question the possible referent to the early part of the Puerto Rican pattern of parental visits to the school that we just described. We actually had one of the parents describe the Puerto Rican pattern when asked what should happen. (See Ques. 26.0.0c and 26.0.0d, Table 9) We explored with the parent what treatment their child should receive during or after this confrontation. The modal response tended to be that the child should be counseled in this public confrontation and the parent should wait until they arrived home to punish the child. But the CPRs seem to want to scold or punish the child at school and then again at home, if necessary. The treatment of the child at home was a mixture of counseling and punishment. The NPRs mentioned both; half the Puerto Ricans mentioned counseling, particularly the CPRs, and half mentioned punishment. The PRPRs appeared to favor punishment. (See Ques. 26.0.0f, Table 9) The sample, with one exception, indicated that it was no different for boys or girls. (See Ques. 26.0.0h, Table 9)

A final important area to explore in the educational ideology of the parent, an area of significant interest for this project, is the relationship of education to occupation. We found in the teachers' interviews an overall view that the parents do not emphasize sufficiently or recognize clearly enough, the direct relationship between education and the occupational careers of their children. In the following discussion we test this view by examining parents' views on these connections.

We found that parents regarded regular school attendance as either very important or important. One hundred percent of the NPRs said that regular school attendance was very important. The CPRs were next most convinced of the great importance of regular attendance. The PRPRs gave as many responses at the "important" level as at the "very important" level. The strong sense that each day counts and that being absent one day is very close to a sin, a pervasive ideology in the school (with its underpinning in the economics of average daily attendance) is not as strongly respected by the recent arrivals as by the North American sample or by the CPRs. It might be remarked that the financing of education in Puerto Rico does not depend on average daily attendance. It tends to be based on number of students registered at the beginning of the year. We think that the economics of school appropriations has a great deal to do with the strength of this ideology about every day counting as a critical step in the learning sequence. That is not to deny that attendance does not have some significant effect on learning. Our general experience is that, from the point of view of the students, the things that they find significant about daily attendance have to do with the student system as much as with their sense of having missed something important in the school work. (See Ques. 27.0.0, Table 9) When we discussed the question of why daily attendance was significant, we found that the PRPRs understandably had no strong rationale since they did not feel so strongly about its supreme importance. The CPRs clearly regarded regular daily attendance as the way to get a good education. The NPR sample had this in mind, but went so far as to relate regular attendance to getting better jobs in the future. (See Ques. 27.0.0b, Table 9)

The question of dropping out is related to regular attendance since dropping out begins to show itself in some degree of absenteeism among most boys or girls. We asked the parents why they thought boys and girls dropped out. PRPRs emphasized that one of the key reasons was because the students did not like school, in addition to mentioning the earning of money and sickness. The CPRs usually mentioned that the students did not like school, and they also mentioned earning money. A few CPRs added the idea that some children dropped out of school because they lacked the intelligence to finish. The NPRs tended to emphasize the desire to earn money as the main reason that young people dropped out. Thus, the North Americans tended to emphasize what might be called a pull factor, that is, the attraction of money, while the Puerto Ricans tended to emphasize negative push factors such as just not liking school, not being intelligent enough, or being sick. Thus, there appears to be an ethnic difference in the ideology regarding the very important phenomenon of dropout. (See Ques. 34.0.0a, Table 9)

The parents tended to have a decidedly negative attitude toward dropping out with the exception of one Puerto Rican parent. But particularly interesting was the difference between the two ethnic groups on whether dropping out was different for boys or girls. The Puerto Ricans very strongly indicated, indeed without exception, that the effect of dropping out was the same for boys and girls. However, 80% of the NPR sample suggested that the effect of dropping out was different for boys and girls. We have again turned up this theme, mentioned earlier, that the NPR sample has a differentiated view of the girls' relationship to education and occupations as compared with the boys. This differentiation is not characteristic of the Puerto Rican sample with respect to dropping out as well as regarding youth-adult behavior. (See Ques. 34.0.0b and Ques. 34.0.0c, Table 9)

The parents display strong feelings that there is a definite difference between a young person who continues to attend school and one who drops out, particularly with respect to jobs. A dropout is regarded as not having much chance for good jobs, and the CPRs emphasize that the school dropout gets the worst job. On the other hand, there is a definite minority in each of the groups that regards the job as not depending entirely on school but on other things, such as the skill of the individual and characteristics about the person. There is clear evidence, however, of strong feeling on the part of the CPRs about education and its relationship to job mobility. This conviction shows up further in the response to the question regarding their feelings about their son or daughter finishing high school. The CPRs strongly indicated that they would regret it deeply if their son or daughter did not finish. The NPRs report that it would make little difference. There is one exception to this; one family reported that they would regret it deeply. Interestingly enough, the PRPR part of our sample did not choose to discuss this rather negative potentiality and so no one gave an indication of what their feelings would be.[91] Nevertheless, we find a definite ethnic difference between CPRs and NPRs in regard to their feelings about finishing high school. Moreover, on this subject the ethnic difference with respect to son and daughter is expressed. The CPRs indicate that there would be no difference in their feelings whether the person in question was a son or daughter, whereas 60% of the North American sample indicate that it would be different whether it was a son or a daughter who failed to finish high school. That is, their feelings would be different. (See Ques. 39.0.0a, 39.0.0b, and 39.0.0c, Table 9)

Turning now toward the more specific aspects of the connection between schooling and jobs, we found that the groups shared views about what schools could do to prepare young people for jobs. These ideas ranged from asking that the school "insist" that the young people continue in high school to prepare them for professional work by preparing them for college. Others felt that the school itself could prepare youths for an office job and two parents wanted the school itself to help them find work. They also wanted the school to indoctrinate the youths regarding the desirability of getting a good job, and with the idea that one cannot get a good job without a college education. One parent suggested the educational theory that the school should arouse in the minds of the young people, before they are twelve years of age, the idea of the significance and importance of education and that then the subsequent developments would be taken care of. These results suggest teachers' view is inaccurate that Puerto Rican parents do not see the connection between education and occupation.

We explored parent views of what kinds of preparation for what kinds of jobs they would ask of the school. (See Ques. 13.0.0a, Table 9) There is no question that the Puerto Ricans emphasized preparation for clerical and sales type jobs while the NPRs tended not to think in terms of specific jobs in response to this question, but insisted that it depends on the person's ability and how long they stay in school, reiterating the ideology of the parallel between amount of education and the job one gets. (See Ques. 13.0.0b and 13.0.0c, Table 9) On the other hand, the parents had some ideas about what should happen, and in their opinion the schools definitely should prepare young people to be able to do office work or to carry out professional work. These are the kinds of jobs that we will describe later as clean jobs. But the point of this is to emphasize that the Puerto Ricans see schooling as the way to get to white collardom or at least that is the way they view what schools should be doing for their children.

There really are not very detailed answers from the parents about how the schools are supposed to do this, except to say they need to teach them all they can. Thus, at least it is not simply years of school but the idea that something is learned in school. We have indicated there is a minor theme of skepticism from certain parents about the direct and unquestioning correlation between jobs and amount or years of education. Some request that schools help young people find jobs. In other words, they have the idea that the schools should function as an employment agency. This idea may lead these parents to be receptive to non-school kinds of "non-formal education" in which training and job programs are offered that also have employment searching programs connected with them.

Having established that there is a fairly strong conviction among the parents that education is rather directly related to the jobs that their children get, we went on to explore how they communicated this idea to their children. About two-thirds of the parents indicated that they did indeed try to communicate the perspective to their children that the job they get tomorrow depends on what they learn today. The Puerto Rican parents tended to emphasize what they learned, rather than getting from one grade to the next. However, CPRs and NPRs claimed they indoctrinated their children. The PRPRs who replied were equally divided between those who said they did not talk to their youngsters and those who said they did emphasize the connection. We also found that many of the PRPRs did not know the occupational plans of the principal sample youths. (This is consistent with the discovery that the PRPR youths reported almost no communication from "significant others" regarding occupational orientation.) On the other hand, the CPRs in particular knew about what their children wanted to do and many knew in great detail about how they planned to go about it. The NPRs were equally divided between those who knew what their child's plans were and those who did not. Again we see evidence for higher achievement motivation among the CPRs living in the same neighborhood with the NPRs and the recent arrivals.

The NPRs did not communicate much to their youths about which kinds of jobs were obtainable under certain conditions for most people in that area, they reported. But the CPRs indicated that factory work and office work and hospital jobs were some of the kinds of jobs that were available on a regular basis to people in that neighborhood. In terms of the U.S. Census category, the modal type mentioned by CPRs was clerical, sales, and kindred workers. The other kinds of jobs that they emphasized were operator and kindred worker. The PRPRs who reported talking about the subject of jobs with their children talked of jobs in that area.

The parents, as might be expected for a population of this kind, very strongly emphasized that they wanted their children to get better jobs than they had themselves. The replies were all positive; all of the CPRs replied to the question in clear terms, yes. (See Ques. 45.0.0d, Table 9) The CPRs reported they advised their children to study hard, to go through school, and to do more than go to high school!

The parents views on who should do the influencing with regard to the jobs that the children want indicated an interesting kind of ethnic differentiation on the question. (See Ques. 48.0.0a, Table 9) The PRPRs very definitely felt that the family was the greatest influence on job aspiration. The CPRs were equally divided between family and school and emphasized that both were involved. In contrast, the NPR sample did not mention the family or the school alone, indicating that both family and school were involved in developing job aspirations; but one person felt that neither was involved nor should be involved. The NPRs discussed the fact that schools could see the potential of students and encourage them, and this was mainly the way that the North Americans felt the schools should exert their influence. The CPRs and PRPRs did not express themselves explicitly on the means that the school should employ to be influential. Perhaps this, then, reflects their emphasis on family influence. But certainly encouragement was the keynote ~~for both~~ family and school assistance in job aspirations.

Turning specifically to jobs and levels of education, the parents were clearly convinced that with an eighth grade education one got the worst kinds of jobs or no better than factory jobs. Over half of the PRPRs felt that eighth grade education only prepared one to be a laborer. (See Ques. 46.0.0a, Table 9) We asked whether the parents felt that the likelihood of the jobs they mentioned, however bad, were the same for Puerto Ricans as for North Americans with an eighth grade education. While 40% felt it was the same, 50% of the CPRs said it was not the same, implying the Puerto Ricans had to have more education to get the same jobs.

The PRPRs seemed convinced that it was different for Puerto Ricans and they often mentioned the North Americans' knowledge of English made the difference. Thus the implication is that for the Puerto Ricans, more education is necessary for the same level of jobs. (See Ques. 46.0.0c, Table 9) Asking the same question with respect to jobs for Puerto Rican girls gets a similar response, the CPRs and PRPRs again tending to emphasize the idea that things are different for the Puerto Rican girls with respect to the job they get with the equal amount of education as compared with the North American girls. (See Ques. 46.0.0d, Table 9)

The parents' knowledge of how much education is necessary for various types of professional occupations indicates that they tend to somewhat underestimate the amount of education necessary for a medical doctor or a teacher, or they do not know. The North American sample is fairly clear that teaching requires four years of college. We included social worker in the question because we felt that many of the families might have had contact with social workers through welfare and other kinds of public assistance programs. In this case the Puerto Ricans again underestimated, most of those who responded indicated that finishing high school was sufficient for becoming a social worker. Engineering, another profession with which the population seemed to have some familiarity, simply because it is a widely known occupation, also draws a goodly number of "don't knows" from the CPRs as well as the PRPRs about how much education was required. The North American sample's responses ranged all the way from some college to college plus.

The views expressed in the foregoing account take on an interesting light in view of what has happened to the principal sample youths, the children of these respondents.

Among the PRPRs, four of the youths had dropped out of school; three girls and one boy. Thus, two-thirds of the PRPR respondents were parents of dropouts from high school. Six of the CPR respondents were parents of Division High School students, but two other CPRs were parents of grammar school dropouts, one girl and one boy. The responding NPR sample were parents of two boys attending a special technical high school that required an entrance exam; two were parents of children attending Division Street High School (although one was retained in the 7th grade, so was a year behind the sample) and one was parent of a girl who had dropped out of the first year in high school. Thus, the attitudes and views in all of their apparent positive tone were expressed by the parents despite a record of extraordinary failure on the part of someone or something. Thus, when one of the teachers lamented that parents did not make strong demands on both their own children's school work and on the teachers who teach them, she definitely foreshadowed our conclusions that strong motivation and aspirations are clearly in evidence among parents, but their expectations of the school seem very low, or at least, they seem to have positive attitudes toward the school despite a high frequency of failure and dropping out of school on the part of their children.

Finally, with respect to the parents' view of the school and the teacher, there is some question about whether they feel they can do anything about the school. In response to a question about this, the general tenor of opinion was that parents could affect the school, but not alone. That is, they had to unite and to organize in some way in order to have an effect on school. This is probably a very realistic perception and it was shared across all subgroups, but was most strongly held by the CPRs and next most strongly held by the PRPRs. (See Ques. 28.0.0, Table 9) In actuality there was no strong organized effort from parent groups to try to influence the school. But should the occasion arise, given the educational ideology as we have outlined it here, there is every reason to assume their expectations of the quality and holding power of schooling for their children would rise to a new level.

Youths' views in follow-up interviews. The follow-up interviews with the principal sample were done at the end of their freshman year of high school. The time would have been the end of ninth grade (freshman in high school) for dropouts who were included in the follow-up interviews.

The high school carried homogeneous grouping to even greater heights of complexity. These tracks might be called lanes or curricula, but they nevertheless were mechanisms that effectively sorted and channeled young people into the rank-ordered occupational world. In an interview one of the Division Street High School guidance counselors explained the formal social organization of students, classes, and curricula.

> High School Counselor: Well, for any kid that enters Division High School, there are one, two, three, four, five, five different lanes, five possible lanes. This goes from basic to advanced placement. The lanes go as follows: basic, essential, regular, honors, and advanced placement. For advanced placement, they get college credit when they graduate. We don't have advanced placement in all subjects, but in some.
>
> Interviewer: Advanced placement is the highest they have?
>
> High School Counselor: Yes. They don't have advanced placement in Spanish for example. But, I believe they have it in history, chemistry, biology.
>
> Interviewer: Now these five lanes apply to any subject that the student would take?
>
> High School Counselor: Yes, it applies to English, social studies, and language, and possibly math.
>
> Interviewer: So it's possible that a student would be placed in one of these five lanes in English, social studies, language, math, etc.?
>
> High School Counselor: Depending on their IQ and reading score.
>
> Interviewer: The IQ and reading scores then are the ...
>
> High School Counselor: determiners. Determiners for all subjects that encompass a lot of reading. And, of course, the arithmetic score would be taken into consideration for the math, algebra and geometry.
>
> Interviewer: If we could talk a little bit about a freshman. What process does a freshman go through? Does every freshman talk to a counselor before his schedule is made out?
>
> High School Counselor: Yes, in the elementary school. We go to the elementary school and talk to them.
>
> Interviewer: You try and arrange a class schedule with them for the following year?

High School Counselor: Yes.

Interviewer: What does a typical schedule look like?

High School Counselor: The typical schedule for what school? A typical schedule for a kid from The Grammar School for example, where your sample comes from, will consist of general science, essential mathematics I, English on the basic or the essential level.

Interviewer: When you say general science, science doesn't have levels?

High School Counselor: Science is essential. Possibly a language, but not likely. Most likely geography, world geography. That is what it would consist of. Now if the child is above average, it may look something like algebra I on the regular basis, biology I on the regular basis, English regular or honors depending on the kid, and possibly a language. That's the above average student. You don't find them at The Grammar School but you find them.

Thus, the criteria used in The Grammar School for "homogeneous grouping" now appear to be key means of maintaining tracks. And, as is well known, the tracks sort out the non-college bound students from college bound students.

Interviewer: If a student did declare upon entering here that he wanted to enter a program that would prepare him to enter a college, would his program look any different?

High School Counselor: His program would look different if his stanines and grade averages reflect that he's a college bound student, but just the student saying so wouldn't. Now, for example, I can take a kid that comes here as a freshman and give her general science or perhaps send her all the way to honors biology. It depends on the stanines. How she scored in general science in the elementary school, on her reading score, and her IQ.

Interviewer: What test do you use to determine the stanines?

High School Counselor: Well, the problem is that we have to work with whatever they bring from the elementary school. I think that they use the Metropolitan Achievement. They use the California Short Form of Mental Maturity as far as IQ is concerned.

Interviewer: Are these tests administered here after they come in or in their last years in elementary?

High School Counselor: In elementary. We test them their first year here. Later, like in the middle of the year, we test them again.

Interviewer: How much difference is there in the program of a student who would go through Division High and would be prepared to go to college and a student who wouldn't be prepared to go to college? In the number of Carnegie units?

High School Counselor: Basically, no, they would have to have exactly the same number of units to graduate, but it would be a matter of difference in subjects and difference in levels. The kid that doesn't go to college starts with basic subjects and moves up to perhaps essential level. It is seldom that he takes a subject on the regular, honors, or advanced placement basis. Another thing, you will notice an overload of courses like home economics, shop, or that kind of thing, vocational. Or, many times they will enter work study programs where they go to school half a day and work half a day.

In the fall semester most of the PRPRs were in the essential track of Division High School; indeed 60% of the PRPRs were in that track. One was in the basic or the lowest track and one was in the regular track, where the majority of CPRs were. Two-thirds of the NPRs in school were in the regular track or above. By spring semester the only PRPR in regular track had dropped back, but the CPRs and the NPRs had not changed their distribution. It is clear that no PRPRs are going to college, and judging by other difficulties in shifting tracks, few, if any, of the CPRs in the regular lane will reach a college goal, unless exceptional and supportive resource-abundant opportunities come along.

By the time of the second interview the composition of the sample had changed somewhat. (See Table 13-) Thus, the responses regarding school tend to be more on the positive side, since the sample youths that remain are largely those who have successfully bridged the chasm between grammar school and high school and have survived the first year of high school. Even so, two of the remaining who were in school appeared to be there on very shaky grounds.

Understandably the principal sample, now high school students, reported that they enjoyed high school more than eighth grade in The Grammar School. (See Ques. 1.0.0, Table 11) While they again mentioned certain subjects and courses as the source of their positive sentiments, changing classes and teachers and the greater freedom to move about the building impressed many of them very positively. Two of the boys who went, not to Division High, but to a Special Technical High School, mentioned new friends as a reason for liking school better. None of the other students mentioned this because, of course, most of their old friends were still with them in the move from The Grammar School to Division High School.

In 1969 more of the students had found something to dislike about school, reflecting the fact, probably, that the sample then included a number of dissatisfied students, who subsequently dropped out, and who reflected their dissatisfactions. (See Ques. 1.1.0, Table 10 and Ques. 37.0, Table 4) In 1969 36.9%, or two-thirds of the responding PRPRs felt they spent too much time in school. The few PRPRs in high school in 1970 all merely said they spent "enough" time in school. Indeed that was the response of all the in-school respondents of 1970. (See Ques. 81, Table 5 and Ques. C3.0, Table 12)

Their appraisal of their school as compared with other schools in 1970 was somewhat more positive than had been true the previous year. There were fewer negative responses in 1970 from PRPRs, but more neutral responses. The CPRs were equally divided between neutral and positive. The NPRs were decidedly more positive and neutral than in 1969, but this reflected the response of the two boys who had qualified by special examination for The Special Technical High School. Those NPRs attending Division High were more neutral than positive.

From the point of view of ethnic features of school organization, high school was somewhat different for the PRPRs. In 1969 the PRPRs all denied that anyone disliked Puerto Ricans, but in high school they indicated there were students who disliked Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. 4.0.0, Table 11) Thus, in a high school with a small ethnic majority of Puerto Ricans, they had encountered and recognized prejudice. Fewer of the CPRs left in the sample reported that others did not like Puerto Ricans, and the NPRs showed a similar change. The NPRs and CPRs showed a similar distribution of views on the question of whether Puerto Ricans were disliked, but the PRPRs were strongly prone to claim they were disliked.

Perhaps related to this development is the decided shift away from the desire to study some subjects in Spanish. (See Ques. C.9.5, Table 12 and Ques. 72.1, Table 5) Spanish had lower status as a medium of instruction in high school than it had in grammar school. This is clearly reflected in the change from 40% of the NPRs in 1969 who would have liked to take some subjects in Spanish, to none of the NPRs in 1970 who would have liked to do so.

When asked again whether they liked Puerto Ricans, the Puerto Ricans in high school showed no sign of negativism toward their ethnic group. One NPR expressed dislike in 1970, whereas none had expressed dislike in 1969. (See Ques. 12, Table 11 and Ques. 12.2, Table 1) However, in 1970 there was a slight increase in the number of Puerto Ricans indicating they disliked North Americans. One of the PRPRs claimed she liked North Americans, and had North American friends, but she could not remember any names. Thus, she displayed a positive public attitude, but no active involvement at the interpersonal level.

The PRPRs still did not recommend North Americans as friends to newcomers in the neighborhood. The NPRs still mix the ethnicity of recommended friends, but clearly favor NPRs. In subsequent choices Puerto Ricans recommended North Americans, but two-thirds of the CPRs and of the PRPRs named other Puerto Ricans exclusively. (See Ques. 11.01a, Table 10 and Ques. 11.0.1, Table 1)

As in 1969, the CPRs in 1970 were still divided between whether they were like their fellow students or not. The NPRs and PRPRs claimed they were like the other students in their school. Thus, the CPRs still showed doubt about their identity with the rest of the population, even more doubt than the NPRs who were in a numerical minority. It is not clear whether the CPRs' ambiguity concerned their identity with other Puerto Ricans, or was directed toward the socio-economic characteristics, the social class characteristics, of the area's population. Our information does not allow for resolution of that puzzle.

It is clear that the principal sample, unlike the previous year, was not fully incorporated into the high school student system. When asked to name the most popular students in school in 1970, only 30% of the students could do so, and 50% did not know. None of the PRPRs could name the most popular students and any one of the CPRs could do so. More NPRs named the most popular students, thus showing that they were enjoying fuller and more rapid entry into the student system than were the Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. C.5.0, Table 12 and Ques. 44, Table 4)

There was some indication of change in academic ideology. The importance of grades suffered a setback. (See Ques. C1.5, Table 12) In 1969 85.9%, but in 1970 only 30% of the students reported that grades were important. Now grades were rated somewhat important. PRPRs had so lowered their estimate of the relative importance of grades that some claimed they were not very important. But in contrast to the PRPRs and NPRs, CPR youths still rated grades as very important more frequently than the other two groups, and in 1970 only they rated grades as very important. Clearly this is again more evidence for the strong level of aspiration and achievement motivation among the CPR youths who were left in school.

Unlike their reports of the eighth grade, none of the high school youths reported lack of attention to their grades. (See Ques. 5.6.0, Table 11) For youths left in school, there was always someone to ask about grades. The NPRs and PRPRs mentioned only parents asking but the CPRs mentioned relatives and friends as well. Also, in 1970, there seemed to be unanimous interest in homework. All reported that someone, usually their mother, asked about homework. (See Ques. 5.1.0, Table 11) There was also an interesting increase in the number of fathers reported to ask about homework, suggesting there may be increased paternal interest in school among NPRs and CPRs when they reach high school.

Just as high school students saw parents express more interest in their grades, they more often reported that high school teachers were more critical of absenteeism. However, the change rested largely with the more frequent reports from NPRs that teachers were critical of absenteeism. There was no change among the PRPRs and CPRs on this question. (See Ques. 8.1.0, Table 11) On the question of the effect of absenteeism on grades, fewer NPRs and CPRs in 1970 denied that absenteeism affects grades. (See Ques. 8.20, Table 11)

The greater negativism about parent visits to the school was reflected in changes in the views about whether parents and teachers were inclined to joke or kid with one another. (See Ques. 15.8, Table 11, and Ques. 28.5, Table 3) While NPRs largely viewed it as acceptable in 1969, they were strongly negative about it in high school. PRPRs who were equally divided, but slightly against it in 1969, became totally negative about it happening. Only the CPRs were still divided, with half of them reporting that parents and teachers were inclined to joke with one another.

In high school, if a parent came to school, as in grade school, it was usually the mother. (See Ques. 4.2.1, Table 4 and Ques. 82.0, Table 12) The students in high school more often said their parents never came to school. From the context it was clear that even more than for grade school, parents came to the school because there were problems. (See Ques. 81.0, Table 11 and Ques. 78.0, Table 5) Thus, when replying to this question, indicating that parents often came to school was like confessing or reporting that they were often in trouble. Parents in school had only negative connotations.

The self-esteem scores in 1970 reflect, in many ways, the changes discussed so far. The general self-esteem of NPR and CPR respondents in 1970 is higher than for the 1969 respondents. However, 1970 PRPR respondents have a lower general self-esteem, 4.7 points below the group average, than the 1969 respondents, at only 1.6 points below the group average. On all the other subscales, the school-academic subscore, social self re peers, and home-parent self-esteem, they are higher than for the 1969 group. The fact that in view of the great number of PRPR dropouts, the few students remaining in high school have scored a relatively great academic victory may contribute to their academic self-judgment.

The NPRs show an unusually high social self-peer score in 1970, perhaps reflecting the change to environments where their own ethnic group is more dominant in numbers. The CPRs show a slightly higher social self-peer score, but no remarkable rise.

The key changes in the scores seem to be in the NPR self-esteem in relation to peers and the drop in CPRs' self-esteem in home-parent relationships. One other point is that despite the lower general self-esteem scores of the 1970 respondents, the PRPRs' other subscores suggest that those who are left in school have not yet experienced damaging effects to their self-esteem from any of their key relations.

(e) Occupational Ideology

While occupation often is seen mainly in terms of education for a youthful cohort like the one with which we are dealing, this need not be the case, and indeed perhaps would better not be the case. The key instrumental developmental task for most young people in the neighborhood is an occupational career to provide subsistence resources. The problem for many of them seems to be that when circumstances and educational problems force them into an early job choice or decision, that becomes an occupational career decision without further upward stages or steps. The one consistently available, easily recognized, means to occupational mobility for this population is continued access to school. Yet educational problems that lead to absenteeism, and then truancy, have the effect of closing off that route.

We will examine the occupational ideology of teachers, parents, and youths, showing how closely in their minds occupational mobility is tied to schooling. We will try to clarify how this ideology places a strangle-hold on the ready development of optional means to more advanced stages to occupational careers. Because of this close association educational problems become barriers to occupational mobility, an effect reinforced by the tendency to use artificial educational criteria to judge qualification for performance of work, qualification for acquiring competence in a particular job, or qualification for entry into most occupations above factory work.

Parental occupational ideology. The occupational ideology of the parents of our youth sample refers to their ideas about work, particularly about what they regarded as good jobs, and what they regard as the relationship of education, or schooling, to occupational development and careers. We were interested in their attitudes towards work and occupations and specifically in what occupational career they would like for their own children. Before we examined their general occupational ideology, however, we turn to their own job experiences, to describe the background of experience in Puerto Rico, their job experience in Chicago, their experience with, or lack of experience, with job mobility and increase in income.

The Puerto Rican respondents were more frequently engaged in operator type occupations than were the non-Puerto Rican respondents. This suggests that our parental sample is consistent with what is known about the general population of Puerto Ricans and employment, namely that they tend to hold operator type positions and relatively infrequently hold occupations at the level of "craftsman and foreman." The PRPR sample holds no job above the operator level. (See Ques. 16, Table 8) The CPR parents hold some jobs in the craftsman and foreman category, reflecting the fact that they have reached higher occupational standing. The NPR occupations were scattered among the categories below professional and managerial levels. One status that is not shown in this table is the status of being on welfare. Among these respondents, one NPR family, one CPR family and one PRPR family, were on welfare. In this table, those respondents are included in the NA.

As one would expect, period of employment in present jobs for the PRPRs is somewhat shorter than for the sample as a whole. The CPRs show long-term employment more often than do either the NPRs or, of course, the PRPRs. Yet, two of the PRPRs had been in their present position for over ten years. This seems to contradict our claim that their children are recent arrivals. But this difference in parent and youth tenure on the mainland are some of the facts that made up our discovery that a Puerto Rican youth's migration history can be quite different from his father's or from his parents', and even from his siblings', migration history. (See section (b) Migration and Neighborhood of (3) RESULTS.)

The stability of jobs held by a good portion of our parental respondents was reflected in their response to the question about what they would change about their present position. (Ques. 16.4, Table 8) Clearly half the group either would not change anything, or is uncertain about what they would change about their present jobs. The other segment of the sample, to which the question appropriately applies, wanted better working conditions, such as better hours, or more hours. The PRPRs clearly wanted better pay for their positions. As we shall discuss later, this reflects a general observation that it takes several job moves and time for PRPRs to reach jobs that pay what might well be described as a living wage or at least a wage that brings them above the poverty line.

On the other hand, except for two Puerto Ricans--one CPR and one PRPR--the group was generally satisfied with their current job in comparison with other people like themselves. They either regarded their job as the same or, better than, jobs that other people like themselves had. (Ques. 17, Table 8) Their open-ended responses to this question indicated that among the Puerto Ricans, at least the bases for suggesting that their jobs were better, had to do with the pay, and interestingly enough, the interest of the job. Only one CPR indicated that his job was the same or better because of prestige. One of the things that the open-ended responses of our sample indicated in relationship to supervision is that a source of job satisfaction was that a person was "left alone" or "Nadie me molesta." This may of course indicate a general worker preference for less close supervision, but it may be particularly relevant to workers of Spanish-speaking origin who find the interaction with non-Spanish-speaking supervisors somewhat strained and somewhat difficult. "Interesting work" is a primary value Puerto Rican workers are concerned with in the work they do. Clearly, there was a predominance of job satisfaction, at least to a moderate degree, in this sample of workers.

In view of our interest in intercultural questions, we asked the sample about their experience with co-workers, a phenomenon we called the "ethnic interface" in the job setting. The general impression and, indeed, the way the respondents described their co-workers was that they worked with "all kinds." (Ques. 18, Table 8) Most of the sample indicated that they worked with all kinds. One of the important things to note, however, is that the ethnicity of their co-workers is by no means predominantly Puerto Rican. The NPRs worked in settings with co-workers who were native-born Americans, or at least that was the manner in which they described their co-workers. On the other hand, the general attitude across all our ethnic subgroupings was that it was okay to work with such a mixed group of people. One-third of our respondents, including the Puerto Ricans as well as the NPRs, indicated that indeed they rather liked it. Further, so far as their co-workers were concerned, the group did not discuss problems with their co-workers on the whole since 72.2% indicated that they had no problems. Only two of the sample, or a little over 10%, complained that there were many problems with co-workers and their ethnicity. This does not mean that there was not some expression of negativism towards some of their co-workers. But in the open-ended questionnaires this negativism was frequently characteristic of the NPR sample with respect to blacks. In some cases the Puerto Ricans, particularly the Puerto Rican women, commented on some problem with the demeanor or style of behavior of black co-workers, but not with pointed emphasis. Yet, responses of the NPR sample tended to reflect their general uneasiness about the non-white ethnic groups with whom they came in contact.

Supervisors, on the other hand, were clearly from white ethnic categories and were mainly native North Americans, although a number were described as North European, particularly northeastern European ethnics. Thus, the Spanish-speaking ethnics were supervised by white ethnics, by European or native American ethnics. (Ques. 20, Table 8) Only one CPR indicated that he did not like his supervisor. The rest of the Spanish-speaking respondents indicated that they were resigned to them, and two CPRs indicated that they rather liked their supervisors. Moreover, the great majority indicated no problems with their supervisors, although one did have problems. Further queries regarding supervisors indicated that they did not praise the workers much and the Spanish-speaking portion of the population had not experienced many cases of negative or disapproving behavior on the part of supervisors. The picture one gets is that supervisors really did not communicate much at all to them. A few individuals talked about being turned back but in the three cases mentioned the individuals claimed they were not bothered by it because it was not their fault. One PRPR report said that the supervisors never indicated in any way whether he was happy or unhappy with his work; but three said the supervisor had told them they did good work and four of the Puerto Rican portion of the sample, indicated that the supervisor showed them they did good work by some manner or gesture. Most of the Spanish-speaking respondents indicated that they had never been told by supervisors that they had done something wrong. This may of course be simply a defensive response, but it is an interesting contrast to the NPR sample that indicated when the supervisor thinks something is wrong he _just_ _tells_ them it is wrong.

The responses of the Puerto Rican sample are scattered through other modes of communicating dissatisfaction such as showing the individual by manner of behavior or by demonstration of how to do it properly. We had the impression supervisors communicated verbally to the NPR sample but that workers of Spanish-speaking origin utilized a non-verbal communication system, a system of communication that is studied under the general label of kinesics. This, we feel, is reflected in the Puerto Rican indication that the supervisor communicated both satisfaction and dissatisfaction by "showing," or by some other indirect means. (Ques. 21.2 and 22.0, Table 8) In the job situation in the absence of a supervisor who speaks Spanish, many of the messages will be carried by non-verbal communication means.[92]

Part of the occupational ideology in the group includes categories of work and kinds of work. Regrettably, we did not carry out ethnosemantic interviewing prior to the development of the questionnaire although we did derive the categories and the questions based on those categories from our participant observation work among the Puerto Ricans.

We asked the sample whether other people liked them and respected them for the kind of job they had. We found that the Puerto Ricans tended to respond "yes" to this question. The great majority of the NPRs also responded positively. As to the types of jobs that were high-respect jobs we picked up some tendency to associate respect with the person and not with the job, particularly from the PRPRs. But on the whole, the highly respected jobs were the professional and managerial proprietor-type, among PRPRs.

The CPRs responded in much greater proportion and their distribution began with managerial-proprietor category and extended to the category of craftsman-foreman. One, however, mentioned non-household service workers as a high-respect job which is perhaps a reflection of his personal self-esteem. The responses of the NPRs who answered the question ranged from professional through the operator category. The PRPRs tended to regard high-respect jobs as those that were relatively far out of their reach while the CPRs regarded high-respect jobs as those that were just the next level above the ones that they now held. At least to this extent the question had some meaning for the Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans. Concerning low-respect jobs, again only two Puerto Ricans responded and they classified non-household service workers and private household service workers as well as unskilled laborers as low-respect jobs. The CPRs concurred and the NPRs classified a whole range of jobs from clerical through non-household service workers as low-respect jobs. The use of standardized census categories to categorize the responses to the question allowed us to define trabajo limpio in standard job terms. Unskilled labor and household servile jobs are not trabajos limpios. High-respect jobs have this quality about them; while low-respect jobs do not have this limpio characteristic. (See Ques. 30, 31, and 31.2, Table 8)

In relationship to the earlier topics, we discussed jobs aspired to and work for children. We can see that even children preferably obtain clean jobs. The jobs that CPRs indicate are high-respect jobs are the jobs to which they aspire. On the other hand, the PRPRs mention high-respect jobs that are far above those to which they seem realistically able to aspire at their present status. However, if we turn to the relationship of schooling to work and to the kind of advice that boys and girls are given it is clear that the Puerto Ricans want for their children the high-respect jobs that they had mentioned, particularly the professional jobs as we will find out, and they see schooling as a way of obtaining these positions.

Related to the question of the ethnicity of co-workers is the question of the respondents' own identity in relationship to the job. We have already indicated they displayed an attitude of satisfaction, in response to the question concerning how their jobs compared with jobs held by people like them. Another aspect of this identity question might be that of the kinds of jobs that are available to people like themselves. We asked the sample what kinds of jobs were available to people like themselves and in response the Puerto Ricans indicated or listed jobs that fell largely in the operator-type category of jobs. Only two of the CPRs suggested the craftsman and foreman type jobs were available to people like themselves. The NPRs showed a similar distribution of their view of what jobs were available to people like themselves. While many respondents did not want to think in negative terms, those Puerto Ricans who did seem to regard professional-level jobs, managerial-level jobs, and in some cases even clerical and sales jobs, as not available to people like themselves.[93] (See Ques. 32, Table 8)

Part of occupational ideology, we feel, is a question of aspiration and level of aspiration. We investigated this subject through questions regarding promotion and chances for promotion. Perhaps it is better to place their present assessment of their chances for promotion and desire for promotion in the context of the more general ideas about what a good job is and what they anticipate for their future. We asked them what kind of job they ultimately expected to have, and we looked at the responses in two ways. First, the type of job that they mentioned was categorized by the general census categories for job positions. We found that most respondents regarded operator-level positions as the job they ultimately expected to have, although one looked toward proprietorship as the kind of job he indicated he would like or expected to have. Secondly, since others answered in terms of the qualities of the job, the responses were coded by categories of qualities of jobs. The Spanish-speaking who responded in this way, and it was generally the Puerto Rican portion of the sample that did so, described the job that they ultimately wanted as a job that paid well; one that has more responsibility and prestige connected with it; and one that is less demanding physically (one aspect of trabajo limpio). Good jobs, by Puerto Rican description, are those that pay well, have prestige and responsibility associated with them and are not so demanding physically.

In the judgment of the people coding the open-ended questionnaires, the CPRs had the strongest indication of aspirations for better jobs, and their aspirations included movement up-the-rank orders of the job levels into management and proprietorship positions or at least craftmen, foreman jobs. Looking at their responses, in terms of job levels, it was the estimate of our coders that more CPRs had upward job mobility in mind than either NPRs or PRPRs. (See Ques. 47.2, Table 8) While eight cases could not be judged, the ten cases that could be, indicated that most showed a high level of job aspiration and the CPRs somewhat more than the other NPRs or PRPRs. (See Ques. 47-48, Table 8) Yet we will show with respect to their present jobs, the CPRs had a strong sense that there was little chance of getting promoted, and of reaching occupational goals.

With respect to their present employment circumstance six of the respondents expected promotion and nine did not, and one, a CPR, was uncertain. (See Ques. 27, Table 8) The NPRs seemed more hopeful of promotion in their present position than the Puerto Rican portion of our sample. Despite their high aspirations, that we have already discussed, the CPRs seemed most pessimistic about promotion in their present job. When asked about the chances this negative expectation is even more clearly delineated. (Ques. 27.1, Table 8) It is clear that the NPRs feel there is a great likelihood or even certainty of a chance for promotion, only one being uncertain. None of the NPRs indicated there was no chance or little likelihood of chance. The

CPRs on the other hand were largely of the mind that promotion in their present job would not occur or they were not certain about its occurring. The PRPRs, on the other hand, showed some propensity to feel that there was a definite chance or some likelihood of promotion. The picture that begins to develop is that the CPRs have high aspirations but are discouraged about the chance of promotion in their present jobs.

The discussions of the requirements for promotion suggest that from the point of view of the Puerto Rican portion of the sample, speaking English, but also, having more skills were the requirements. The NPRs on the other hand tended to feel there were no requirements or that just working harder was the main requirement. The CPRs were slightly more concerned with skills than the PRPRs.

Understandably, the CPRs were the ones who wanted to change jobs when we asked them. (Ques. 28, Table 8) NPRs indicated that they did not want to change jobs. Although the responses indicated that the PRPRs had some degree of ambition to move up to the craftsman-foreman level, they really felt on the whole that there was little chance of their getting the opportunity to change jobs and to reach higher levels.

Since English was mentioned earlier as one of the requirements for job promotion by a number of the Spanish—speaking respondents, we explored a little further the question of the relationship of English to their present job position, asking them whether they felt the ability to speak English affected their work. Of course, the NPRs often viewed this from the outside and while one indicated that "yes" it did affect his work; the other indicated "no." ~~Surprisingly~~, CPRs felt that speaking English did not affect their work. Two PRPRs felt this way too, but the other PRPRs felt that speaking English definitely affected their job. The affects they described were not usually connected with job performance, directly. One of the PRPR respondents indicated that knowing English would mean she could communicate more easily when she went into the head office. Others suggested that it would resolve some of the problems in the use of the telephone. A bilingual secretary or clerk in the office would have resolved both those needs. The emphasis on the use of English is not with respect to the skill performance of their jobs but with respect to the communication with the people connected with their jobs, particularly with their supervisors.

This would suggest that the improvement of their vocational circumstance required English language for working with supervisors, but not for the requirements of increasing performance skills. These points-of-view of course raise questions about whether English is essential to job performance, or a symbol of qualification that may, or may not, (and if the CPRs experience is accurately reflected in their responses) often is not essential to skilled job performance. We, thus, began to suspect that knowing English was in many cases an artificial barrier, raised to justify holding of Puerto Ricans at rather exploitive wage levels and to justify passing them over when promotion was in order.

For a population like this, job training might be viewed as a way around the stagnation in advancement by promotion. We asked the respondents whether people like themselves ever needed training, and what kinds, and how they would go about getting it. We found that they seemed to have very poor conceptualization of job training beyond the possibility of on-the-job training by co-workers or by observation and practice. (Ques. 49, Table 8) Most respondents simply did not know whether individuals like themselves ever needed training and could not suggest what kind. In response to the question of how, the five people, CPRs and NPRs only, who did respond, talked only in terms of training by co-workers or direct on-the-job training while observing an operator, then practicing, and operating machines themselves. The PRPRs seemed quite ignorant of the possibility of adult vocational-training programs that might allow them to improve their job possibilities and were unable to suggest a type of training program. This result suggested to us, that quite apart from our study of the youth sample a much better program of contacting and orienting recent arrivals from Puerto Rico, might get them established financially much more quickly. Otherwise, they experience occupational disabilities longer and are subject to artificially discriminatory promotion policies.

We have been discussing the parents' occupational ideology in the context of their own work. However, we did discuss with them some more abstract notions of work and its relationship to life including the question of the general importance of work. The entire sample indicated that work was important; none regard it as just somewhat important or not important. Half the sample, including equal numbers from all the subsections indicated that work was very important. (Ques. 36, Table 8) So there is a strong, positive work ideology operating in this group of respondents from a "poverty" neighborhood. They even more strongly indicated that work was important to a man. The significance of work for women is somewhat different. Although our question did not differentiate work in general, from work outside the household, our general impression is that the responses are in terms of work for women outside the household. The tendency is, particularly among the PRPRs to regard work for the woman as not very important. The CPRs tended to regard it as important, and in equal proportion, "very important" and "somewhat important." The way the question was asked was sufficiently ambiguous for us to feel that the responses should not be depended on too heavily because we have the feeling that the meaning of words were interpreted differently by the PRPRs than by the CPRs or the NPRs. Still, with some clarification it is interesting to note that the CPRs tended to regard work even for women as important while the PRPRs did not feel so strongly about this. This might well be related to a further question we asked regarding women working. We found that the adult women in the household tend not to work outside the household in the CPR families! They do in about equal proportion in the NPR families and in the greater portion in the PRPR families. The situation is that while the CPRs regard work as important to women they must be responding to the question in terms of the general idea of work activity and not only with respect to work outside the household. Perhaps the PRPRs are also responding to that, but they are in a circumstance where most of the women must work outside the home.

Under what circumstances is work outside the home justified? We asked about this and whether a woman loses respect because she works outside the home. The general sentiment was that she does not lose respect, indeed in some ways she gained more respect according to some of the Puerto Ricans, but to most it made no difference in the respect accorded her. The general concensus of opinion was the men preferred that the women stayed home, particularly when it involved taking care of children. The NPRs expressed themselves as strongly on this as the Puerto Ricans. But under some circumstances the men might like it particularly if the women were working outside the home to help pay the bills. (Ques. 38.2, Table 8)

These responses are understandable in light of the fact that when a respondent indicated what kind of effect a woman working had on the household, the Spanish-speaking mainly mentioned neglect of young children. They showed great concern that it had an effect on the children. Considering the fact that the age-range for most of the Puerto Rican parents was between thirty-five and forty-five, and the fact that they were still having children, we suggest that there is realism in this concern. Certainly the absence of day care facilities justifies their concern. The strong tendency of upwardly mobil Puerto Ricans, like the CPRs, as well as recent arrivals, to closely restrict their children through the teenage years, to maintain hijos de la casa, places even more importance on the child-caring mother, in protecting the children of the household from the debilitating influences of the environment. An already existing culture tradition has adaptive value in the "dangerous" environment of Chicago barrios. But, it creates conflict with the many facets of the North American independence training complex.

Moreover there are cultural patterns that govern the division of labor with regard to children and Puerto Rican households that makes this a particularly adaptive concern in the context of Puerto Rican families. The strong tradition is that child-rearing is the responsibility of the mother.[94] The traditional mother-father division of labor may be seriously affected by the wife's working outside the house.

In a study done in Puerto Rico, Rogler and Hollinghead discovered that schizophrenia in the mother had a much more severe affect on the children than schizophrenia in the father. Rogler and Hollingshead's related this to the nature of the division of labor in child care between males and females in Puerto Rican households. It has suggestive implications for the circumstance in Chicago where economic circumstances force mothers to work in order to bring the family income up to minimum wage or to basic subsistance level in the city. Child care centers for new arrivals on the mainland might be exceedingly important, but they should not just be confined to early childhood, if they are to be centers that are adapted to the social organization of the Puerto Rican families.

Our observation among the Puerto Rican families suggests that the ones that were able to get around the child care problem most easily were Puerto Ricans who managed to re-establish extended family relationship in the city and to use one of the women in the extended family network to care for their children, including youths in the sample. In other cases these relationships were accomplished through commadrazco relationships. The North American response to the condition would be to underline the need for day care centers, and perhaps indeed this is quite appropriate in the setting. However, we feel that the day care organization might best be adapted to the social organization of the Puerto Rican family. That is, measures be undertaken to encourage the establishment of close propinquity among members of the extended family network, that day care centers look to the possibility of providing space for extended family network members to care for children, and that older siblings be employed in the day care centers after school and in evenings as a source of employment and training. We will further elaborate on this suggestion in the last section of the report.

We also found that some CPR women, none of whom were in our sample, were able to combine the traditional requirements of mother-homemaker role with small business proprietorship. The businesses were usually dress shops, beauty shops, and florist shops, but it is an occupational route that is overlooked for women and so far as we are aware no training programs in business proprietorships for Spanish-speaking women exist.

In summary, it is clear that once financial circumstances allow the Puerto Ricans to do so, the mother in a family of younger or subteenage children will stay in the home, at the preference of the husband. If economic circumstances continue to allow them to do so, she will probably continue to stay in the home, and from our observation, babysit for her daughters and sons who themselves may have to go out to work. The preference for the non-working wife in the context of extended family relationships may have great adaptive advantages for the Puerto Ricans when this is allowed to operate in a naturalistic manner.

The children also are covered by the work ethic, and at least the notion that work is important from the point of view of Puerto Ricans, as well as our sample as a whole. We asked our sample whether children should work and found over half said "yes" but an interesting proportion of the Spanish-speaking part of the sample said "no."

Somewhat over half the NPRs were all for children working and approximately half of the CPRs expressed the same view. Among those who said "no," the strongest reason was that children should only go to school. Even the "yeses" were not always "yes" because they often were qualified by age or school conditions. The main qualifications had to do with age and there was some preference for children not working before the age of fourteen. But the general sentiment seemed to be that they should work particularly if their work was needed by the family. The better-off CPRs often referred to youths' working to earn money for their own clothes and school supplies, but in other cases, there were references to the fact that their money would be valuable to the family on limited income. (See Ques. 39, Table 8)

The jobs parents usually had in mind were clerking and delivery jobs. This ideology of work for young people is interesting in connection with our discovery which we will report elsewhere that most of our principal sample of Spanish-speaking boys worked somewhere at jobs of this sort, when they could get those jobs. But it should be clear that approximately one-third of the CPRs and PRPRs wanted their children to devote themselves entirely to going to school. This suggests, in the face of PRPR needs for extra income, a strong tendency to value education and schooling very highly, a perspective that is somewhat contrary to that of the teachers' perspective on parental support of education.

One other aspect of work ideology is the view of people regarding not working and under what circumstances. We asked our sample what they felt about people who did not work when they were not able to or were too old to do so. The general response was that if you are sick, it is okay that you do not work, after all you cannot work. There is a general impatience among our respondents particularly among the CPRs with the claim that one does not work because one cannot find a job. Their strongly expressed view was that these people are lazy. This is perhaps what one would expect in a population of people who have a strong work ethic as we have indicated that they have and who themselves have come to the United States, for purposes of improving their occupational circumstances. They expressed a good deal of strong impatience with people who wish to receive welfare funds because they cannot find a job. On the other hand, consistent with Berle's finding, among the Puerto Ricans, sickness is a legitimate reason for not holding a job.[95]

Interesting differences between the NPRs and the Puerto Rican portion of the parental sample showed up when we ask the question of how important college is to getting a good job. Without exception the Puerto Rican part of the sample indicated that college was important. But the NPRs were divided equally between those who said it was and those who said it was not. (Ques. 44, Table 8) Puerto Ricans gave the same answer to the question of importance of college for males and females, for jobs. The NPRs showed the same differentiation of male versus female occupational ideology, suggesting college was important in some cases for jobs for males, but not to a female's getting a good job. We find a stronger sentiment in favor of college on the part of the Puerto Rican portion of our sample than for the NPR part of our sample, a result that might surprise a good many North Americans including North American teachers.

Our respondents would advise a boy to stay in school until he had gotten enough education to get a certain job or to establish himself in a career, and judging by the response to a later question, they implied professional career. (Ques. 40, Table 8) The Puerto Ricans in their responses did not spell out with precise clarity the relationship between the level of schooling--for example, high school, some college, through college, and the job that they had in mind. The NPRs were better able to do this and tended to respond in terms of recommending that a student go through high school, go to college or training, post-high school training course, or through college. We suggest that knowledge of the relationship between school grade levels and some kind of occupational opportunity is unclear, or that it is information not available to the Puerto Ricans, neither the CPRs nor the PRPRs. They do not respond to the question about schooling. Advice that the sample would give to a girl is in some ways similar. That is, the advice is given in terms of attending until a certain age, or in more cases until a certain course is finished, such as high school and college. There is a greater tendency to advise girls in terms of other contingencies, such as until they get married.

In general, Puerto Ricans have a positive sense of the relationship between school and jobs and advise their youngsters to go to school and to attend beyond eighth grade, that is, through high school at least. They show strong evidence of ambition for the children going beyond high school and on to college. The Puerto Ricans' knowledge of the relationship between occupation, types, and educational levels would probably be dependent on the acquaintanceship with people who were college graduates. In this respect we find that the North American sample know more people in Chicago who have finished college, although in very few cases are they part of their closer family relationships. The CPRs and PRPRs know college people, but in all cases where they were mentioned they referred to their being in Puerto Rico. So they probably do not have good social network contacts for increasing the precision of their knowledge about the relationship between certain occupational types and educational levels.

The parents were asked about their view of Chicago schools' success in preparing their children for work. In this respect the parents, particularly the Spanish-speaking parents, tended to be quite critical. In their view, there was need for improvement in the way the Chicago schools prepared their children for jobs. All the parents, in all of the subgroupings of the parental sample, were favorable to the idea that the school did need to improve the ways in which it prepared their children for jobs.

The suggested improvements included doing such things as teaching office skills, providing more and better work-study programs, (and remember these are work-study programs for children who are in junior high school as well as high school students, since the children of the Puerto Rican parents were often over age for seventh and eighth grade.) Among other things they wanted vocational counseling including that directed toward college and better scholarship opportunities. They also suggested having financial support at high school levels. However, when we asked the parents what the schools were doing to prepare the children for work, we found all of the sample was rather vague about the programs that were going on in the schools, including the 80% of the NPRs who were uncertain. The PRPRs were understandably uncertain although they did indicate that the ordinary courses were part of what the school was doing to prepare the children for work. The CPRs on the other hand had some more definite views on this, although not remarkably so. But, 25% of the CPRs said the schools were doing nothing. Their attitude towards the school system fits into their general pattern. We have seen previously these higher aspirations for economic and educational and/or occupational mobility as they relate to their expectations of the school system.

Teachers' occupational ideology. In the teachers' view, the Puerto Rican parents do not have very high educational expectations or occupational goals for their youths. But the occupational ideology and considerations are seen by the teachers mainly in terms of their educational ideology. Thus, to illustrate, when teachers were asked about occupation they tended to use educational levels as a label to categorize jobs; e.g., college-type professions; high-school type occupations; eighth-grade type job or eighth-grade class jobs. Indeed, a repeated theme in the teachers' discussion of the parents is their wish that the parents would indoctrinate their children in the fundamental and primary significance of education for the childrens' occupational attainment and indirectly their whole life-style.

As we have indicated, the teachers' perspective on childrens' occupational futures is heavily influenced by the ideology of the close link between education and occupational opportunity or possibility. Occupation and the occupational careers that one chooses are seen to be mainly the result of the educational level that one reaches in school. An ancillary aspect of this ideology is that making it in school is what results in having access to the opportunity to enter a particular career. The close connection seems a logical outcome of the experience of a number of the teachers.

On checking through the background of the teachers, only the three younger teachers under thirty went directly from high school into college with a professional occupation in mind. The four older teachers entered teaching later in life. One of the older teachers had gone through college directly from high school, but with no intention of becoming a teacher. The two women teachers entered the pattern of marriage and the housekeeping career, interrupting or delaying other career plans. The two older men finished high school and then took on full-time jobs, in both cases skilled jobs, worked for a number of years, then entered higher educational institutions on a part-time basis, and supported their families while they attended these institutions. Finally they acquired their teaching degrees. Even now none of the four older teachers are exclusively working at teaching.[96] The two men worked at other jobs, one teaches music lessons at an evening high school; the other in a print shop. One of the younger male teachers also worked in the print shop and our information is that it is quite common for the men and some of the women teachers to hold other jobs in addition to their school teaching positions. One of the women teachers also moonlighted in a job outside her household.

The tendency of the older teachers to see education as not only linked to occupation but as an inevitable contingency to occupation was reinforced by their own experience. Yet they were not simply involved in a single occupation nor had they had only experience with that single occupation. Their occupational careers were characterized by multiple jobs both diachronically and synchronically. The older teachers particularly, the men, had the clear experience of moving up in the occupational career hierarchy as a direct result of working while attending school. Yet, they did not often emphasize this optional pattern.

In the teachers' view, the parents' goals for their own children were mainly for obtaining factory work. One teacher felt the parents did not realize what types of jobs might be available. This teacher brought up the example of the possibility of an occupation as commerical artist for youths who showed exceptional artistic talent. By implication one might have suggested that the talent for other artistic kinds of careers such as, fiction writing, musician, and so on, could well be overlooked. Our interactions with the students indicated that despite their discouragement about education and jobs in the more commonly thought terms, there were young men even in the Latin Disciples who regarded themselves as writers and who showed us examples of their work. There were young men also among the Disciples and in the eighth grade who were members of musical bands, who earned money in this fashion. Consequently there seems little reason for overlooking the general careers in the entertainment world as possible occupational careers for many of these young people, but it was very very uncommon to hear these types of occupations discussed either by the teachers or in our interviews with the parents.

Three male teachers, admitted that they simply had so little contact with the parents, and they could not form good judgment of what the parents' occupational goals and ambitions were for their children. This lack of contact on the teachers' part was often attributed to the lack of opportunity to meet the parents under other circumstances than when their children got in trouble, or to a lack of interest on the part of parents in seizing opportunities that were available to "visit" the teachers in the school setting. One of the teachers in the context of discussing this lack of contact said that, (perhaps as a way to rationalize his lack of contact with the parents) he was not there to educate the parents but to educate children. He was the same teacher who suggested that some kind of social center where parents and teachers could meet on neutral ground might be a very useful kind of organizational arrangement. Thus while on the one hand, rejecting the notion of his obligation to interact and to know the parents, he on the other hand showed the sensitivity to the deadening effect of threatening atmosphere of the school for a parent.

One of the younger teachers was conscientious about orienting the youths occupationally. He was known to have ambitions of becoming a school counselor, and perhaps his activism with regard to job orientation to his class was related to that ambition, but nevertheless he actively engaged in work orientation. The other two younger teachers of the eighth grade, however, showed remarkable lack of interest in occupational future of the students they taught. The teacher, who taught the lowest-tracked eighth grade, admitted that he simply did not know what the occupational futures of his students were likely to be nor what the occupational goals of the parents for those students were. The other teacher admitted that from her point of view the occupational future of the students were quite low and as far as she knew the boys in most cases did not know what they were going to do, although, if they thought about it, most would probably aim for factory work and some would go to college. In her view, the girls mainly looked forward to marriage, having babies and a family.

There is an irony in the fact that contact of teachers with the parents were with parents of the most troublesome students. But biased views of what all children's parents are like are only corrected by those few occasions the school sets aside for parents to come to the school setting to visit teachers and classrooms, occasions which it is notoriously difficult to get hard-pressed parents and particularly parents who do not speak English, to attend. Teachers were poorly informed about Puerto Rican parents' ambitions for their children and as we find, they were inaccurate about many of the Puerto Rican parents' aspirations.

The teachers' views of the occupational future of the students varied in correlation with ability-ranking of the homogeneous grouping of the classes. They structured their response in terms of whether one was talking about the top group or the bottom group. The bottom group in this hierarchy as we have related was formed on the basis of reading scores but modified in terms of classroom social behavior. In the teachers' views those in the lowest group had very little likelihood of going to college; and only half to a third were generally regarded as being able to finish high school and most would be lucky to get anything more than graduation from eighth grade and a year or two in high school. Indeed most would probably drop out by the second year of high school to get jobs particularly, the girls, in the view of three of the teachers. On the other hand if the teacher were referring to one of the two top groups, one got a very different tone to the answers. The top groups were described as very optimistic about themselves, having the highest of expectations although some of the girls might "yield to the temptation of the flesh," as a teacher put it. His group, he said, looked forward to "college and academic careers," even the lowest-ranking members of the group were highly optimistic about their future.

Another teacher suggested that all of the top group in our sample's eighth grade year could make it to high school and "do anything they wanted." However, she was fearful of their determination and motivation to take advantage of their ability. She feared at least one-half would not finish high school, and nevertheless still had "high hopes" of at least half finishing high school and going on to college. Some of the group, particularly those boys who went to the Special Technical High School (only NPRs were admitted) she felt could count on finishing high school and go on to college, although that meant only four out of a class of nearly forty. This teacher had nominated eight boys and felt that she could have nominated at least twelve. She discussed with the interviewer the regretable circumstance that there was no analogous high schools in the city to which girls might be sent. The implication was that if a student made it through the Special Technical High School, he was well into a college-oriented track. The school was not necessarily oriented to college but to a higher level of craftsmen or technological types of occupations. She remarked that even from the top group many of the students would be taking on jobs such as typing, working in restaurants, delivery boys, and indeed might leave school to enter those jobs full-time. This same teacher was re-interviewed during the following year when she was teaching the lowest-track eighth grade group. Her description of their futures was very different. She felt almost all of them would not finish high school, perhaps one-third, if any would finish high school. Most of the girls she remarked would marry, get jobs, and of those, perhaps three might finish high school. The majority of the students, she said, would drop out in the second year of high school to get jobs or to marry, particularly office jobs and probably would work at menial work of some sort. The same would hold for the boys except they might have such jobs as restaurant workers and delivery boys. In this connection she remarked that there was a great need for specialized vocational training for some students because going on to high school meant they were simply going on to the same thing. The same kind of academic program they had received in grammar school they already found was irrelevant to their entry into a work career. The interview with this teacher underlined the basic perspective that led us to undertake this research: that lifetime career decisions are being made by this population of youths, particularly the more recent Puerto Rican arrivals, and vocational assistance and programs including extra-school programs need to be geared to seventh and eighth grade or junior high level. She underlines in her interview with us, the fact that many have left school and that the vocational program would best be located outside of school because of the Puerto Ricans' strong organized academic bias.

The other older teacher who discussed at some length her perspectives about the students and their occupational careers suggested that the more able students, particularly the Puerto Rican students, with whom she worked, often had high ability but lacked confidence in their ability. Attendant to that weakness, they also lacked good work skills. It was the purpose of her special class to concentrate on these particular problems. She said that given the sheer physical size of many of the students it was not good to hold them back because it simply created more problems for them as they continued in elementary school or until they either reached legal age, school-age, or became completely disillusioned with the program. She went on to say that when they got into high school some worked anyway to find something they were able to do well and will finally see that they want to do something. With earlier work-study programs they might develop goals so they would try to learn to use their school experience to advance their occupational goals.

In this same teacher's view the parents' concern about the occupational goals of their children, particularly their ability to see the relationship of education to occupation was very limited because they were so concerned with survival, including the children and survival, that it was difficult for them to spend much time worrying about the niceties of occupational development beyond a job that provided subsistence for the family. She said many of the children did not have as much time to come to school with the parents working, implying that they have serious obligations in the household. Teachers frequently mentioned that girls were kept home to babysit, and this was a frequent explanation for the absenteeism among the girls. The teacher went on to say that parents may not be interested in education and the need for occupational development, because survival meant having enough food and a place to live and that consumes the major part of their energy.

This teacher, as well as others, referred to the negative effect of the Puerto Rican parents' desire to return to the island on their educational ambitions. They suggested this contributed to the parents' lack of interest in occupational development and advancement. In a somewhat related connection, one of the other teachers talked about the school's obligation to teach young Puerto Ricans to compete in the economic arena. He expressed concern over the students' lack of drive for success. He intimated that this might be a cultural problem, that the Puerto Rican hierarchy of values did not include this drive and that it was the school's obligation to assimilate the youngsters to this pattern in order to prepare them to compete in the economic arena. A related point-of-view, offered by a fourth teacher was that the lack of independent training on the part of students led to lack of motivation in school work, and perhaps inhibited occupational aspirations. As we noted above, the younger teachers seemed to have fewer opinions and perspectives on occupational futures and occupational goals of the students. Those they had were rather stereotyped. For example, one young teacher indicated that perhaps the top group would finish high school and go on to college, but among all the others, the girls were mainly anticipating heading for marriage, babies, and a family; and the boys probably did not know what they wanted, but would probably mainly go into factory jobs. A few, she went on to say, would go to college.

In sum one can draw from this very descriptive account, that the teachers' conceptualization of student occupational aspirations, as well as the future of students, is really rather limited. That is beyond relating educational attainment to some kind of general categorization of jobs the teachers were not well acquainted with the complexities of occupational structures nor with the occupational realities of their students' lives. Their main and key distinction seemed to be a "college-non-college" kind of orientation. Finishing high school meant one had a high possibility of going on to college; failing to finish high school meant that one gave up college for all time, and thus gave up access to "college-type occupations." Curiously none discussed the process of leaving school; working at one job for a while; and then moving on to a high occupational position by going to school part-time. Admittedly some seemed to allude to this possibility but expressed pessimism that it would be a course of career development for most of their students despite the fact their own work careers followed that pattern.

The perspective for the girls in terms of occupational attainment was particularly depressing. Yet the teachers in other contexts seemed well aware of the fact that most of the girls would eventually enter into occupations, sometimes rather soon after the inevitable marriage that they had in mind for them, that were extra-household jobs.

From the point-of-view of the teachers, one of the most serious deficiencies in the parents; occupational orientation was the deficiency in their educational ideology. That is they felt for various reasons that the parents were not well-oriented toward the significant and close relationship between education, success in school, and access to higher levels of the occupational structure. In many cases they indicated that their major problems were that the parents had not indoctrinated the students properly in some of the detailed rules, and even to a passionate desire for an education in order to have a good occupation.

With respect to girls, many of the teachers recognized that there were special problems in relation to career, when we include as part of that career the job of housekeeping and housewife, that faced Puerto Rican girls. Perhaps this can best be expressed first from the point of view of the teachers who discussed these problems with interviewers. It was their observation that inevitably during the school year, two or three, or, perhaps four of the eighth grade girls became pregnant; usually these were Puerto Rican girls. They were often shocked that the mothers of families of the girls seemed reluctant to take them back, or more often seemed to force them into marriage when the girls were only initially involved with the young boy but not yet pregnant. Thus they would hear about conflict between a young girl and her family over the girl's relationship with a boy. Then the course of the relationship might be that the girl would go off with the boy or go to the boy's family to live with him. When pregnancy developed, from the teachers' point of view, the most desirable course was for the girl's mother or family to take her back. Thus, they were often shocked when the girl attempted to return but was refused entry into the parents' home unless she entered as a married girl. These circumstances, of course, often led to girls dropping out of school.

The cultural explanation for the Puerto Rican parental behavior is associated with the traditional emphasis on virginity, the high evaluation of the good reputation of the daughter of the family and the degree to which the family itself in its own self-respect depended upon the sexual reputation of its daughters. Thus there is a related tradition for regarding the girl as married by concensus of the couple and entering into a consensual marriage, regarded traditionally in Puerto Rico as a perfectly legitimate form of marriage. These arrangements could be further legitimized by a legal marriage but they were respected in the same sense that a common law marriage has been respected in the past in North America. However, if the girl was known to have been with a boy overnight or over several nights then from the point of view of the girl's family her reputation was lost and to take her back as anything other than a married woman was a serious breach of the family's self-respect and reputation.

The dating pattern of North America which was strongly reinforced by practices of the schools particularly beginning in junior high, and the general conditions of life in the neighborhood, contributed heavily to the likelihood that a young girl would get involved with a young boy and thus run awry of the traditional Puerto Rican pattern regarding the girl's reputation, and the inevitable course of events that followed. This culture conflict is highly relevant to the occupational development for girls because it increased the frequency with which girls were removed from the educational ladder to higher occupational goals. Many of these girls did return to school, although they inevitably of course became pregnant. And with pregnancy they entered into the housewife's role. But soon after that, they entered into the other work pattern that characterized most families, particularly the Puerto Rican families of the neighborhood of going out to get a job as soon as they found someone who could babysit or take care of their child. Indeed, in some cases, while the child was young they began to babysit for another young mother's child and develop babysitting exchange services. The pessimistic perspective of the teachers toward the girls' occupational future was heavily influenced by this repeated experience with the girls in eighth grade. They tended to generalize it of course and felt that it reflected negative Puerto Rican attitudes toward the girls' occupational aspirations, which as we have demonstrated, is an inaccurate belief. We find that the expressed ideology of the parents was for girls to enter into higher level occupations. But the force of stress from the conflict in culture codes seemed to inevitably lead to decreased occupational chances for girls, particularly Puerto Rican girls.

From the foregoing discussion of parental and teacher ideology, it is clear that teachers' views of parental occupational ideas are vague and inaccurate. But, it is also clear that parents have little more than very generalized ideas about what teachers do or teach their students so far as job-related knowledge is concerned, except for the fact that teachers are teaching in English and that therefore, presumably, their children are learning English. It is clear that parental occupational aspirations are higher than the teachers suspect. But the teachers' occupational expectations of the students are rigidly tied to grade level and track (or level of the students' "homogeneous" class group).

Very few parents think in track terms, and in intermediate grade levels. They think in terms of major school transition levels--grade school, high school, college. In light of these contrasts, the students' views on some of these issues are worth close examination. Moreover, we can examine the students' expressed views from the high school context as well as from the context of their eighth grade year.

Students' occupational ideology. By the time they are in high school the students are not bereft of a work emphasis, but rate it less important than their parents. They look on work, as important, but tend to view the importance of work for men in somewhat less extreme terms than their parents. (See Ques. 22.0, Table 11 and Ques. 36.1, Table 8) Over half the youths see work for women as not important, while more parents see it as important, but less so than for men. The CPR parents most often rate work for women as important, but their children in high school tend, like their peers, to rate it as not important. On the other hand, more of the youths than their parents, particularly among CPRs, agree that children or students should work. While all the CPR youths felt students should work, about 40% of the CPR parents said they should not because they should devote full-time to school. (See Ques. 25, Table 11 and Ques. 39.0, Table 8) In fact, most of the CPR boys, as well as PRPR boys from the sample who were still in school held part-time jobs.

While the youths were in eighth grade they responded to several questions concerning their views about their jobs and their views on the relationship of education to those jobs. When we asked them what were good jobs, the students clearly thought that professional jobs or clerical jobs are the best jobs. None mentioned managerial or proprietor jobs as being among what they regarded as the best jobs. The CPRs clearly located good jobs in the upper third of the U. S. Census standard occupation category of jobs. (Ques. 29, Table 3) The PRPRs in contrast tend to include equal numbers of mentions of such lower rank jobs as operator and non-household service worker. The NPRs' mentions also were scattered more broadly through the categories than were the CPRs, but they clearly were weighted in the direction of the professional jobs as being good jobs. In terms of the specific kinds of jobs that were mentioned, the NPRs tended to list lawyers and doctors as professional categories they had in mind and the CPRs tended to mention teachers and nurses as the professional jobs that they had in mind. The professions mentioned among the NPRs were all by boys. The NPRs also mentioned detective, policeman, and office worker as good jobs but not factory jobs. The CPRs regarded teachers and nurses as professional jobs that are good jobs, but did not mention lawyers or doctors as frequently. They also mentioned detective, police and office work as good jobs. The PRPRs did not mention doctor or lawyer as good jobs but only mentioned teachers as professional jobs that they thought were good. But the rest of the specific types of occupations they mentioned were scattered throughout the scale including the mention of factory and non-household worker jobs.

The jobs were described as good jobs for a number of reasons. Puerto Rican students reflected their parents' values in mentioning the jobs as good jobs because they were nice, clean, "limpio" or commanded respect. Pay was not mentioned by the Puerto Ricans but was mentioned by the NPRs. On the other hand, Puerto Ricans mentioned jobs as being good jobs because they served humanity while the NPRs did not include this as a reason for describing a job as good. The rest of the responses from the Puerto Ricans were scattered among a range of descriptive responses, but one can surmise that for some reason Puerto Rican youths when thinking about good jobs think of them in other specific terms than mainly because they pay well. That is not to say this is not part of their evaluation of good jobs. It is just that in describing why a job is good they tended not to use this as a descriptor.

Between eighth grade and high school, the PRPRs have changed their perceptions of what jobs are good. (See Ques. 22.2, Table 11 and Ques. 29.0, Table 3) In 1969 PRPRs mentioned many lower ranked jobs such as operators and non-household service workers as good jobs, as well as professional-technical ones. By 1970 the PRPR respondents cluster their responses to the same question around the top levels of the occupational hierarchy, naming nothing below craftsmen and foremen as good jobs.

The CPRs of 1970 showed less extreme preference for professional-techinical jobs than in 1969, and name business proprietorships among good jobs.

The NPRs perceptions looked very much the same, as the previous year, with the same range from professional through clerical to craft men type jobs. They did not mention proprietorships or managerial positions at all. The NPRs reflect in their ready choice of craftsmen position a contrast with the PRPRs and most CPRs. Skilled crafts, the most unionized of the occupations, are further out of reach for the Puerto Rican youths than are professional jobs. On the other hand the valued quality of trabajo limpio, may contribute to their tendency to ignore those jobs. CPR parents, did not, of course, but they are viewed as potential advancement for adults outside the aegis of formal schooling.

By 1970, PRPR students shared with the CPRs and NPRs the preference for selecting professional jobs. (Ques. 22.2a, Table 11) But a second strong preference among PRPRs is for clerical and sales jobs as good jobs. The latter are also the jobs that all the PRPR respondents would like most, and that two-thirds expected to get after their schooling is over. (Ques. B3.5.0 and B3.4.0, Table 12)

The CPRs name professional jobs as the best jobs. A smaller group agrees with the PRPRs that clerk and sales-type jobs are good jobs. But the CPRs show an exceptional response in naming proprietorships as good jobs; a category that no NPR nor PRPR mentioned. One CPR even mentions a craftsmen-type job. Like the PRPRs, they list clerical and sales jobs most frequently. One CPR dropout who is working in a factory would like a factory job. Except for this same youth, all the CPRs expect to have clerical and sales jobs after their schooling is over.

The NPRs strongly favor professional jobs, clerical-sales jobs and craftsmen-type jobs as good jobs. The NPR responses to the question of what job they would most like, mentioned craftsmen-type jobs or professional jobs. They expect to have the jobs they like when their schooling is over, unlike the CPRs.

The Puerto Rican youths show a tendency to have wanted the most-liked job they mentioned for a longer period, usually two years, than do most of the NPRs. (Ques. B3.4.1, Table 12) The NPRs tend to have wanted the job they mentioned for a much shorter time, suggesting their "wants" are in flux. Consistent with this is their reported uncertainty about getting the job they think is most likely after their schooling is finished. (See Ques. B3.6.0, Table 12) In sharp contrast, the PRPRs are quite certain they will get the job they mention and most like. But the CPRs are again intermediate in that all feel neither certain nor uncertain. But in this case they have long wanted certain jobs, but feel it likely they will get much lower status jobs (compare Ques. B3.4.0 with Ques. B3.5.0, Table 12).

Students of course might have in mind the fact they need help for obtaining jobs they thought were better and so we asked the students what kind of help they needed in order to obtain these jobs. (See Ques. 30.1, Table 3) The NPRs in discussing the kind of help they wanted mention that they wanted help with opportunities for college. The Puerto Ricans tended to put their responses in terms of an opportunity for further education, suggesting that they also wanted help with the intermediate steps in education, mainly high school and perhaps completion of eighth grade. But basically help with more education was what most of the students felt they wanted. Thus they see help toward the jobs as being help from the school, but nearly an equal proportion reported that they had not received help. The CPRs seemed to be more definite about having received help from school regarding getting good jobs or the means of obtaining good jobs while the PRPRs are negative about this help. The response might be surprising if we had not already discussed the rather complex nature of the social organization of the school including one grade such as the eighth grade, which might well create a circumstance in which the CPRs were having a very different educational experience from the PRPRs although they were in the same school and in the same grade. The basis for this lies with the social organization of school and its effect on the relationship of educational processes on occupational disabilities.

There of course may be some question about whether the youths feel they need help or not. We found that about one-third of the NPRs felt they did not need help, but the Puerto Rican students specified that they would like help in getting a job that they think is a good job. They want help with the means of getting those jobs. So while the PRPRs are negative with regard to the help they are getting, they very strongly agree with the CPRs in that they want help. (See Ques. 31.3, Table 3)

After a year in high school there is even more emphasis on the need for help. With further education nearly two-thirds of the youths want help with education because they see more education as the means to the job they want. (See Ques. 22.4, Table 11) A little over half of the youths said they had received help, but once again the PRPRs report the least help. A smaller portion of CPRs than the previous year reported receiving help. Only the NPRs reported more help from the school. Thus, high school seems to be offering NPRs the occupational help they need, but is doing less for CPRs and little or nothing for the PRPR youths to help them establish a work career in what they think is a good job.

Our increased interest in occupational ideology per se during our second year's research led us to include questions in the follow-up interviews on "significant other."[97] The results of the use of the questions were not so much disappointing as tragically sad, particularly with respect to the PRPRs nearly total lack of people in their lives to develop work-career orientation. The NPRs do have someone who talks to them about work in school beyond high school, including school counselors. (Ques. B1.1.0 thru B1.4.0, Table 12) And they may know someone who has gone on to be successful through advanced education. The CPRs and PRPRs report none of these kinds of discussions, even with school counselors. No one, by their own report, talks to CPRs and PRPRs about different kinds of jobs, or the benefits that different jobs offer. They have no one to talk with who has the jobs they have thought about wanting. (Ques. B1.8.0 - B3.3.0, Table 12) The respondents may of course be disregarding reality or they may not relate their experience to the question. But only the NPRs report some conversations and contacts with people who exemplify or converse about the varied aspects of their educational future and occupational future. Whether or not this particular set of interview questions were good, verbal eliciting frames, one finds it hard to deny the evidence from a range of responses. Occupational information is appallingly short in this population, particularly in the PRPR population, but even very much so in the CPR population despite signs of much higher achievement, motivation, much longer residence, and greater experience in the continent's job market.

It is still problematic whether information and knowledgable orientation to occupations and their relationship to stages of the educational career, will really change the rate of access of this population to better jobs. Information without other resources or means may be empty knowledge, not instrumental knowledge.

One of the important phenomena that affects the lives of these students is dropping out of school and we wanted to find out how they viewed dropping out of school in connection with their occupational ideology. We asked about the effect of dropping out on their chances for getting a good job. They reported that for a boy dropping out not only prevented him from getting a good job, but it also meant he did not earn enough money. These two consequences were the most frequently mentioned but the Puerto Ricans were more preoccupied with another consequence, a consequence that might be regarded as losing the possibility of access to a means. The Puerto Ricans frequently mentioned that dropping out meant that one did not get a good education, one did not learn English, and one did not know enough, or was not skilled enough to keep the job one got. They had a strong educational-training orientation, and regarded dropping out as taking away from a person the means to the good jobs they might want.

Their views about the girls dropping out are quite similar to that of the boys. In this case the NPRs showed a somewhat different response. A third of the NPR youth indicated that it does not matter to a girl after she marries whether she drops out or not. These youths then reflect a tendency we found in the NPR parents to regard education, and reaching a higher level of education, as less important for girls because they would get married. Some Puerto Ricans expressed a similar attitude; there was strong sentiment in favor of a good education for girls among the Puerto Ricans. Yet the Puerto Rican girls, according to our observations, were more seriously affected by marriage or marital relationships with boys in the last years of the eighth grade than NPRs. This is a circumstance that we have explained in terms of cultural differences in the code of rules governing sexual relationships.

The PRPRs' views of the consequences of dropping out had shifted from seeing it as limiting learning or knowledge toward the CPR and NPR ideology that dropping out keeps one from getting a good job. (Ques. 32.1, Table 11) The CPRs mentioned the same view even more frequently. But the NPRs tended to talk of consequences in terms of living a miserable life. Thus the education-job connection has intensified for the Puerto Ricans while the NPRs are thinking of it in terms of loss of "the good life."

The youths' ideology concerning why boys and girls leave school shows interesting commonalities and differences when compared with the parents' ideas on the same question. The CPR parents and PRPR parents favored an alienation type of explanation, boredom or not liking school, as did the CPR and PRPR youths. The NPR parents chose notably different modal response, "to earn money." The NPR youths were also notably different from the CPRs and PRPRs in mentioning trouble at school as the reason for dropping out. The NPR parents and youth both differed from the Puerto Ricans, but moreover also differed from one another. Both groups of Puerto Rican parents on the other hand used explanations similar to that used by Puerto Rican youths.

One further question regarding dropping out that might be very important to these youths in making decisions about their occupational careers is how they weigh the relative merits of finishing eighth grade against attending at least two years of high school. (Ques. 34 and 35, Table 3) The response to the question suggests that the students generally have a very strong prejudice in favor of a couple of years of high school being a great help over simply finishing eighth grade for getting a good job. Interestingly, however, PRPRs were less convinced that finishing the eighth grade would help. They seemed to display more skepticism about that. On the other hand, the NPRs were rather thoroughly convinced that finishing the eighth grade helped with getting a job. Puerto Rican youths, then, do not as frequently view completion of eighth grade as a help in getting a job as compared with the North Americans. They also display more skepticism about how much two years of high school beyond the eighth grade is going to help with getting the good job that they have in mind. This view is not shared by the CPRs. The skepticism tends to be characteristic of the PRPRs, and is an interesting exception to the public ideology, communicated through the mass communication channels that each increment in education increases in equal proportion the possibility of getting much better work. The PRPRs may be closer in their view to the actual statistics which indicate that the income a person gets with two years of high school, as compared with completing the eighth grade, is not that much greater. The real jump comes with the completion of high school as compared with two years of high school

In 1970 one clear difference between the NPRs' and the Puerto Ricans' occupational ideology is that NPRs expect lower-ranking jobs with an eighth grade education than do Puerto Ricans. (See Ques. 20.1.2b, Table 11) With that education, CPRs and PRPRs expect factory and clerical and sales jobs. NPRs associate eighth grade education with non-household service work and unskilled labor. But the ideology that the kind of job one gets depends directly on the education one gets is as resoundingly held by youths in 1970 as by their parents. (Ques. 37.0, Table 11 and Ques. 40.0, Table 8) They are equally strong in high school, as they were in grade school, about the necessity to attend college in order to get a really good job. (Ques. C9.9.1, Table 12 and Ques. 67.3, Table 5)

There is a little less conviction than in 1969 that English is necessary for getting a good job, and this skepticism comes from the dropouts. (Ques. 9.9.2, Table 12, and Ques. 67.3, Table 5) Yet, their beliefs about the importance of English shows no sign of slackening motivation to learn it. This was a persistent component of their outlook throughout the data. They think English is important and are motivated to learn it. (See Ques. C9.9.0 thru C10.3.0, Table 12) There are signs of negativism toward Spanish, although some of the CPRs who have not exploited the opportunity to develop Spanish seem to desire to do so by the time they have finished their first year of high school. But their occupational ideology still does not include clear ideas on the advantages of fluency in two languages for their future work plans, although some, including CPRs particularly, already may feel a sense of regret at not having fully exploited the linguistic resources of their background.

Whatever one's belief about the level of education that is associated with certain types of occupation, if one wants more education, particularly college education, financial resources must be at hand. But, the reality of their limited resources are reflected in the students' responses to questions about income and family finances. The NPR youths report their families' incomes are average or above for the neighborhood, a slight underrating judging by our other information. But equally important from the point of view of their own occupational possibilities is the estimate, from every NPR respondent that his/her family could afford to help with college. (Ques. 1.7.0, Table 12) Both CPRs and PRPRs with two exceptions report, on the contrary, that they must work to help support their family. One PRPR feels his family could, with sacrifice, afford to help him with college. One CPR reports her family could afford to help her with college. But with those exceptions the picture for financing collge, should they want to go, for CPRs and PRPRs is very grim. The education they believe is necessary to get the best jobs is unobtainable without outside financial help. The CPRs and PRPRs tend also to report average income, with the variable in the direction of below average income. (Ques. 1.8.0, Table 4)

Occupation and the gang. The gang itself was a kind of natural employment agency. When one member got a job at some place and more jobs opened up in that place, he recruited other members of the gang for those other jobs. Thus it is a kind of indigenous employment agency. Our activity with the gang heightened this function of the gang to a new level of sophistication. The role of the supervisor (who was bilingual and whose job it was, through participant observation, to try to acquire the culture of the gang) very quickly came to support individuals in a range of areas but in two key areas of particular interest here. One was in the school area; for example, encouragement for school success; advisement and help with some homework; help with application forms for colleges; encouragement and help for remaining in school; counseling and support for wanting to return to school; counseling on the decision to drop out; and helping and supporting gang members when they wanted to reapply, after having dropped out for awhile and deciding it was not the wisest thing to do. We discovered that dropping out was not a sudden event for most school leavers. It was a long drawn out process usually beginning with a mixed attendance-truancy phase. The next phase was staying out for many consecutive days or weeks. But intermittent efforts to go back, to try again and again, were quite common, we found.

But even returning to school itself required a good deal of elaborate information of the resources and opportunities of the City. Some of the youths in the gang could not bring themselves to go back to either of the local high schools, although they wanted to return to school. Division Street High School seemed to be so unsuccessful in its educational efforts that about two-thirds of the boys in the gang had dropped out or were in the process of dropping out. Thus the Center supervisor explored other resources that were available that fit a particular boy's needs. He helped a member to go through the process of entering a program that allowed an individual to finish high school while working. Then the Center supervisor actually helped the individual in the process of entering into the world of that institution that happened to be located in downtown Chicago. The territorial attitudes of the gang members were such that certain spatial areas, or parts of the City, that were dominated by Whites were very fearful places for them. They feared for their physical well-being in some respects, particularly when the Whites called on cops; but they feared also acts of prejudice and this is often a source of reluctance to utilize services that were readily available to them and for which they qualified. The Center supervisor would take individuals to these places and see them through the initial trauma of the encounters of a new setting and new institution. In some ways the gang could have offered, to a limited degree, this same kind of service. It could serve as a source of information for the person who had decided to go downtown to a White dominated institution. But it was as likely that the information would increase his fear as that he would get information which decreased his fear. Yet, the gang was an excellent network in which job information resonated. When something happened to one member; for example, one member went to the job corp, then his experience with job corp, his know-how with entering job corp, and the outcome of what happened in job corp became well-known within the gang. In this instance the job corp experience however was a bad experience. So the effects of this information-resonance can be negative from the point of view of the agency that attempts to offer some service.

The Center supervisor became a kind of broker. He increasingly was aware of the problems and circumstances in the individual's lives and would set out trying to locate agencies or programs in the City that met the particular problems that the individual was experiencing. At the same time he increased the repitity of the flow of information about schooling and job opportunity. Once an individual chose to accept a service, the supervisor was there to help with their continuing participation, a very important supportive function for a population like this that often had fears and doubts even after having gotten up the courage to go through the process of even entering some program.

It is our impression that the school status of the members tended to change between the beginning of school in the fall and late spring, say April or May. The low figure for dropouts in the gang was September or October, but this rose increasingly as the school year went on so that even some students who by all ability and indication should have been able to make the minimum passing grade level had dropped out, either because of constant problems arising from frequent truancy or from other kinds of encounters. One student, by April, was being strongly encouraged to drop out by a counselor because as the counselor described it, it was a wast of time of the teachers trying to teach him and a waste of the student's time to stay in school. So there is no question that, with some regularity many of the gang members had the experience of "being given up on." Apparently memory of being given up on sometimes faded away during the summer and by fall they were ready to enter the academic battleground once more. But this inevitably seemed to lead to the cycle of failure, since there seemed to be no mechanism for ameliorating or rehabilitating their ability to operate within the context of the school setting. The programs that seemed at this point to be most attractive to the boys were the programs that combined working with schooling.

One or two of the members had attempted night school at a nearby high school. But it appeared that the night school experience of many of these young men is deadening and devastating as was their experience with the day high school. Frankly it appeared that the deadliest part of the experience was the standard pattern of assign-study-recite, the usual classroom pattern for communicating education to these young people. Despite the high dropout rate, there was a generally positive attitude toward getting one's high school degree, perhaps for utilitarian purposes only, but nonetheless it was definitely believed that getting a high school degree was really important.

Jobs were an essential part of the lives of most of the young people in the gang. Working part-time for most of them was a necessity simply because their families could not support them. Indeed the ability to continue school actually often depended upon having a job, at least a part-time job, if not a full-time job. As we note in other sections, the contributions that these young people made to their families were often absolutely critical for the survival of the family in this neighborhood. Thus this was no business of simply earning money to get extra change.[98] Their jobs were an integral part of attending school. As we have noted earlier, the academic status of the gang members probably ran the full continuum of academic work from exceptional success to almost total failure, failure in the sense of being illiterate at fifteen or sixteen.

In the gang there was no negative attitude toward college attendance; quite the contrary, the desire to go to college was often expressed even among those who did not have even a ghost of a chance in attending college. And in the gang itself, one member won a scholarship to Macalester College, the only Puerto Rican from Chicago that had ever attended Macalester College on a fellowship. The leader of the gang was a college freshman during the year of our work with the gang. Other members of the gang expressed desire to go on to college or to junior college. So their educational ideology was not negative.

However, even the most successful students related during extemporanious interviews that working part-time had always been a critical factor in allowing them to attend school. The explanation was that one was so beset by fears that lack of money brought about, that having a part-time job gave you the security to allow you to concentrate on school. Now of course holding a part-time job not only was a function of its availability but of whether it coordinated with the demands of the school. Thus one of the successful scholars in the gang took part in interviewing for the 1970 Census, and so did one of the leaders who himself was a dropout. This leader was considering, with some seriousness, the possibility of re-entering the YMCA high school, which he had attended before when he was granted a part-time job.

In summary, this gang, and perhaps other gangs, was an excellent point for continuing contact for agencies concerned with better employment and career development of male youths. It is also clear that even though quite young, the members of the gang often were in need of "rehabilitative programs," programs quite different from school-like programs, in order to set them on their feet in new directions for occupational careers.

IMPLICATION OF RESULTS

While the details of the results may be variously interesting to agency professionals working with Puerto Rican clients, the results most relevant to SRS may be related to eight key points.

1. From the analysis by ethnicity it is clear that the Puerto Rican population in the low-income sector of the city is not homogeneous, but contains a substantial population of high achievement-oriented and upwardly mobile Puerto Rican families.

2. Given limited economic resources, the Puerto Rican families that appear to be most successful at coping with the environment of the Division Street enclave, are those families that re-establish extended family ties on the mainland to serve as a network used to pool a range of different types of resources.

3. Physical dangers and bad influences (e.g. drugs, criminal activity) in the street environment of the city lead Puerto Rican parents to exercise extreme control and restriction over the movement and whereabouts of their youthful offspring, severely limiting their social contacts to home, friends' homes, and school.

4. Where close family supervision fails to provide physical security, emotional support, and subsistent and adaptive resources, local gangs may provide those needs to male youths. Gangs, thus, may operate as multipurpose, multifunctional male voluntary associations, particularly for youths experiencing serious conflicts with parents and with school.

5. Difficulties with English language programs of the school, the marginal economic conditions of their families, and serious conflicts over cultural differences in behavior codes ("authority" for boys and codes governing heterosexual relations for girls) force Puerto Rican youths, particularly recent arrivals, into exceptionally early occupational career commitments.

6. Cultural differences alone do not appear to be the source of disadvantagement for Puerto Rican youths, but the association of the cultural differences with differentiating social organization, labeling by differences in cllture and language, and sorting of the linguistically and culturally different youths into low opportunity situations do transform the differences into disadvantages.

7. Schooling, vocational training, and job advancement of the Puerto Rican population are seriously restricted because of the simple lack of bilingual-bicultural facilities in the institutions in which they work and/or learn. Provision of such facilities would remove, for most of the population, socially disabling effects of Spanish language and Puerto Rican culture, although other kinds of problems would still have to be dealt with. The nature of the refluent pattern of migration of Puerto Ricans requires that Puerto Rican youths be, at least, bilingual, and at best, bicultural; thus one of the most debilitating conditions in their lives is the near absence of bilingual-bicultural programs in the urban schools of the continent and the small town schools of the island. In brief, institutional disadvantagement is a key source of the Puerto Ricans' educational problems that lead to extremely early career commitment and occupational problems.

8. There is a serious deficiency in occupational, or vocational, training orientation among all parties included in the sutdy. Teachers are not only ignorant of parental occupational ideology and goals, but they see occupational career entry very narrowly in terms of school grade levels and test-score-based track (or lane) hierarchies; parents are vague and uninformed of means of entry into jobs and are largely ignorant of means of training and preparing for occupations other than full-time schooling; youths, particularly Puerto Rican youths, seldom communicate with, or are communicated to, by significant others regarding specific jobs, related training, or job conditions and benefits; and they have few contacts with individuals holding the kinds of jobs they aspire to. This was true despite high occupational aspirations among Puerto Rican parents for their children. Both subgroups of Puerto Rican parents and youths placed a great value on education for both girls and boys, and adhere firmly to the belief that the level of education one reaches is closely related to the kind of job one will be able to get.

The decision to analyze the data by ethnicity and to further divide the Puerto Rican population into long-term residents and short-term residents led to the discovery that not only the children but the parents represented a different population with respect to many aspects of occupational and educational ideology. Among the parents this did not mean that on questions of culture-coding of behavior they diverged from recent arrivals; to the contrary, they seemed to have conserved most of the Puerto Rican cultural traditions. Where questions pertained to work, education and occupational mobility, occupational aspiration, and practices that helped assure economic mobility of themselves or their children, they often were less like the North Americans or the short-term Puerto Ricans, than the latter were like one another. Their high valuation of work, including the importance of work for women, of education, of college aspirations, of keen interest in what takes place in school, and other responses began to form a pattern of evidence for their distinctively high achievement orientation and strong determination that they and/or their children would successfully reach new levels of socio-economic well-being.

They displayed a distinctively positive orientation to small business proprietorship, a view that was reflected in the occupational ideology of the CPR youth as well. Moreover our participant observation had discovered instances where CPR mothers were engaged in small businesses located in or adjacent to their homes, thus allowing them to conform to the strong adherence to the culture rule that mothers should be at home to take care of children, but at the same time fulfilling the high valuation of work for women, and contributing to the effort toward mobility. One would hardly call this segment of the Puerto Rican population occupationally disabled, yet their children were not free of the symptomatic phenomenon of dropping out of school, (although at a lower rate than for short-term Puerto Rican youth) nor of the effects of discrimination practices by institutions. Their children were threatened with classification as Educably Mentally Handicapped, and though often had to take steps to resist, they experienced more extreme effects of generation gap than the recent arrivals, in this respect being more like the NPR sample. Thus, the CPR youths' self-esteem scores on home-parent relations were lower in high school than had been true of eighth grade scores.

Perhaps because time allowed it, we found that the CPRs who had re-established extended family ties, or who utilized compadrozco relationships more easily, dealt with the problems of having baby-sitters or adult supervisors for the children in the home while mothers worked outside the home. There was some evidence that the gossip network among related children in the same school also helped to maintain control over children's school behavior, a system quite typical of town life in Puerto Rico. Other shared resources included housing, food, money loans, transportation, know-how, jobs, and for new arrivals all the many supportive necessities to make the process of adaptation go more smoothly.

The distinctiveness of the CPR population at the level of youth is reflected in the tendency of the CPR youths to be more like the NPR subgroup than like the recently-arrived Puerto Ricans. But their responses to questions bearing on grades, importance of school work and regular attendance, were biased in the direction of high achievement answers, even where this involved divergence from both NPR and PRPR subgroup responses.

Both CPR and PRPR parents reacted to the physical and "moral" dangers of the streets by exercising tight control over activities and location of their children. If there were any hint of their daughters being involved in activities with boys where adult supervision did not meet their standards, they kept their daughters at home. This often brought them into conflict with the school's increasing indulgence in boy and girl pairing off for many activities, such as excursions. A strict sex segregation by schools or any institution sponsoring programs for Puerto Rican girls would have had more success with attendance and parental support from Puerto Rican parents.

This close control over their children, both male and female, brought parents into conflict with the street gangs that were, of course, youth-dominated control groups. But the gang was a haven for Puerto Rican youths who had run afoul of the school because of behavioral or academic problems there, and of the home because their acculturation to North American youth behavior codes had created serious conflicts.

We discovered that gangs though feared by many of the parents and some of the principal sample youth, were not negatively nor fearfully regarded by all the youths in our sample. Moreover through a mini-demonstration project we discovered that the gang can provide an associational structure in support of values such as academic performance, college attendance, job hunting, job adaptation, occupational training, resistance to hard drug use (although marijuana and alcohol were in relatively regular use by most of the gang members and were regarded as very different matters). We discovered that the gang in addition provides for the basic needs of physical security, cooperative sharing of limited resources, and active organization of "something" to do for youths of the neighborhood. Finally we discovered at the less individualistic level maintenance of territorial ethnic identity was provided by the gang (as observed by Suttles in another part of Chicago)[99] but at the same time the gang provided for organized adaptive syncretism of Puerto Rican and North American culture.[100]

The gangs were found to be the only age-voluntary associational form that penetrated broadly through the lives of the community youths. Other youth-age volunteer associations including extracurricular activities of the high school and of churches, for example, involved a more limited number of youths on individual or family basis only, particularly hijos de la casa; but no other voluntary association than the gang organized as many neighborhood street youths to such a structured degree as did the gangs themselves.

We discovered that the internal organization of the gang was so structured into seniority levels that it had the capacity to perpetuate on an "intergenerational," or better said "inter-age-cohort," basis. That is to say, it need not cease to exist when the older members entered into institutional arrangements such as college, marriage and employment, that would ordinarily drive them away from the neighborhood and remove them from membership in the gang.

More than one gang can occupy the same geographical area so long as they are not competing for the same ecological niche, that is, primarily, that they do not compete for the same age group, but also that the activity foci of the gangs do not lead to competition for the same resources of the neighborhood.

Leaders, the "president and lieutenants," had to rate high on at least three key qualities or qualifications in order to maintain their positions in the gangs. In addition to shrewdness and subtlety in interpersonal skills and the exercise of authority, and in addition to a generally high level of intelligence that allowed them to help resolve the problems that arose in the lives of individual members and to the gang, and to locating economic and other resources that maintain the existance of the group, they also had to be able to "handle themselves," that is, they had to be physically able to defeat challengers. Physical prowess was a primary value in this physically dangerous territory and was reflected in the high valuation of accomplishing leadership in the gang. We found that gang membership was not necessarily antinomous to success in school--for example the leader of the gang with which we had close contact, the Latin Disciples, his junior or senior year of high school was voted the most popular boy in the high school. We discovered that the qualities of leadership mentioned above were part of the socialization process accomplished by the internal seniority levels of the street gang.

We discovered that research and program information was a key commodity that gangs had found to be useful as a trade item in order to gain resources from the more opulent sectors of the society via the police, social service agencies and research groups like ourselves. The police, social service agencies and research groups could become "trading partners."

We found that the syncretisms of culture represented in the gang reflected the mixture of the ecology of the poor neighborhood, the language and music of the island and the continent, the tripartite resources of three major cultural modes of the setting: the youth subculture mainly provided the gang members through mass media and through events of the city and the city streets; the culture of the island through parental influence and transmigration; and the dominant stream of North American culture, including many middle class values and goals as they are reinterpreted through working class perceptual screens.

The population on which this study focuses is younger than the population with which SRS and perhaps even programs ordinarily deal. The age range of the youth population with which we dealt ranged from 12.5 years at our first contact to 18 years of age toward the end of the project. The first cohort of youth with which we dealt in the first year of the project ranged from ages 12.5 years to 16 years.

In general we feel that poverty level youth encounter key factors early in their lives that force them to make key and critical occupational decisions significantly earlier than youth from average or above average income families, thus leading them into low income levels and a low occupational aspect. The effort of youths to resolve immediate psychological and social relational problems leads them to make key and determinate occupational decisions significantly earlier than is true of the average income population in the U.S.

The average, or above, income youth, of course, are not free of problems. But the decisions they make early in their youth are not as critical to determining their life time occupational career, because the average or above income youth has what we call "resource redundancy." That is if one solution does not work, then the family and the youth have a second chance. Thus in this case we could illustrate by saying if the youth encounters serious conflictual problems in interpersonal relationships with the teacher in a school perhaps in the seventh or eighth grade then the family resources may allow the family to send that youth to a more expensive and private school but at least to a school where the youth will not encounter the same problems. An alternative available to some low-income families was to move to the suburbs. However, the move to the suburbs required at least the economic resources to purchase a home and to have the transportation facilities to continue to be able to reach the job sites of working members of the household. This alternative is open to few people. Just what part discriminatory practices in real estate purchases in the suburbs played in reducing the possibility of the Puerto Ricans' access in this eventuality was not clear in the data that we were able to gather. We do know that the NPR sample, even though many had language problems, turned to the suburbs in order to deal with problems. We found the Puerto Ricans of long term residence in Chicago were able to use the suburbs as a way to handle problems, particularly educational problems of their children, by moving to the suburbs. The alternative to a local move from one ghetto school to another, for Puerto Ricans, was to send the youth in question back to Puerto Rico or indeed to move the family back to Puerto Rico. Resource redundancy means one has optional means of dealing with problems that arise. The higher the income of the family the greater the number and range of possible options the family has. The less the income, the more one is forced to what is offered by the circumstances of the environment that exist, and one is more subject to the social forces around one.

Supportive ameliorative resources provided by an agency can increase a family's resource redundancy. To illustrate, in the project's neighborhood youth center when problems arose for the youths the supervisor-counselor, who was there in a multitude of capacities, helped the youth in question to secure or attempt to secure alternative resources that allowed him alternative solutions to his problems. In several instances a new job created serious conflict for some of the youths. The center supervisor counselor was able at a strategic and appropriate time to give information, new orientation, and to suggest supportive training objectives or means. Thus the center and its personnel was a supportive resource; although mainly offering information it was done through personal, rather than impersonal, means allowing the individual in question to seek out supporting resources from other places and agencies in order to solve a particular problem.

We review at length the conflicts centering around the general domain of "respect." North American teachers tended to see the conflict as "lack of respect for authority." The whole relationship was shot through with subtle differences. Teasing and joking, one aspect of the exercise of authority with a "velvet" glove was differently coded by PRPR students and NPR students, with CPR students in an intermediate position. Moreover, some of the relationships that could be conducted with joking and teasing in eighth grade, by high school were disapproved by PRPRs, specifically relationships between male teacher and female students.

The cultural differences however, were the only occasion for behavioral problems that led to labeling as "a behavior problem" and assignment to "tracks" within the grades. We review the way in which teachers use the track hierarchy to organize their views on occupational expectations. This, then, is the key consequence of cultural difference, that is, they have effects because they are employed to categorize and allocate people to groups that will have differential access to opportunities for occupations and that represent some degree of economic mobility and more adequate resources in their lives.

Many of the intellectual problems of Puerto Rican youths occur because the school program is based solely on English, even in schools with up to 70% Puerto Rican population. (There were a few experimental bilingual programs.) Thus, the schools themselves had inadequate programs, a fact that their teachers seemed to recognize in their unanimous recommendation that more fluent bilingual teachers be added to the staff. Well designed bilingual-bicultural programs from elementary through high school probably would drastically reduce the academic problems leading to school leaving. Moreover, it is the only kind of program to prepare Puerto Rican children for the bilingual-bicultural style of life that refluent migration entails. The agencies which deal with this population should seriously attempt to develop not only bilingual personnel, but bicultural service and treatment programs.

Other problems such as young Puerto Rican girls' problems with the schools' lack of control over boy and girl contacts, probably will not be dealt with by such programs. School programs and extra-school vocational training programs should seriously consider all-female training programs, even though new policies against discriminatory practices against women might create some difficulties for such program plans unless carefully designed to avoid unfair treatment in training and occupational opportunities.

Even in working settings it appears that English language facility is not the solution to promotion and mobility that it has been claimed to be. Many CPR household heads who do know English claim it has little relevance to skillful job performance and are more skeptical about promotion than are NPRs and PRPRs. Thus, English language may be an artificial rather than functional barrier to job opportunities. This is probably also applicable to occupational agency programs. Language is an easy "scapegoat" for interculturally inadequate programs.

There is a serious, acute lack of accurate occupational information and sophistication in this population, including its school teachers. It could perhaps be regarded as a first order need in the population. They need information that will improve the caliber of occupational decisions being made by the youths, by their parents, and even the occupational expectations of the teachers themselves. Certainly, information without the opportunities will not resolve the subsistence problems of the population. If, however, opportunities exist a given population that has no well-constructed cognitive framework for planning strategies leading to seizing the opportunities, or perhaps demanding that opportunities be made available, then this too is a social disadvantage or an occupational disability.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION OF RESULTS

Although the project was initiated from the idea that cultural antinomy in codes governing social relations, could be viewed as primary causes of social disabilities, we found we had to modify that approach if the data from observations, interviews, and questionnaires were to be interpreted for sound programmatic purposes. Those culturally different codings that made a difference to peoples' occupational careers and lead to disadvantagement depended upon their use in a labeling process leading to the assignment of a person to a category of persons who had differentially low access to efficient means to economic mobility. Cultural antinomies existed that were not involved in labels significant to social organizational arrangements, and these differences did not, we hold, lead to disadvantaged occupational career positions in the school system, or later outside the school system. Furthermore, we found that the disadvantages of being culturally different often were as attributable to inadequate provisions on the part of institutions that presumably offered services, to the disadvantaged among others, as to deficient abilities and cultural characteristics.

It was true, that professionals in the institutions tended to attribute failures to deficiences in the client population--e.g., teachers saw Puerto Ricans' problems as lack of motivation for education and a poorly developed commitment to the ideology of the strong contingency between education and occupational opportunities for their children. Yet quite to the contrary, on examination, we found no such deficiences in motivation toward better education nor in the ideological conviction concerning education and occupation among Puerto Rican parents, particularly long-term resident Puerto Ricans. Thus, nonexistent deficiencies were attributed to the group, while in actuality, lack of institutional provisions for dealing effectively with differentiated client characteristics put some clients at a disadvantage.

For Puerto Ricans the process was further reinforced by the labeling and sorting that went on in conjunction with language characteristics and cultural differences. In school, new arrivals often did not know English, but it was the absence of Spanish language teaching programs and the exclusive use of English language ability tests that put them in "low opportunity" school tracks. The institution created the disadvantages insofar as the program available in the school was one that was appropriate to a small minority of the student body, not the majority of the student body. But the same kind of reversal in attributing the cause of the problem to the client can happen to any social agency that is careless of the instrumental needs of its potential clientel for utilizing the services it offers.

This rather negative conclusion regarding our original conceptual framework led us to re-examine the concept of social disability as it applied to cultural difference in view of the history of its use as a psychosocial analog of physical disability. We developed a skepticism about the social consequences of viewing cultural difference, particularly those that contributed to conflicts, as social disability. This skepticism is not new to the field of therapeutic services. The continuing controversy over the definition of psychosocial problems as mental illness, and therefore like a disease has many close parallels to our problems and difficulties with treating social disability with the same etiological models and client qualification procedures that are used for physically disabled.[101] This argument does not imply that rehabilitation treatments of physical disability do not have important and relevant social features and some parallels to the processes that produce social disabilities from the culturally different. For example, the process of labeling can contribute to the oppression of a deviant group in very subtle ways, whether the deviance is physical, psychological, or cultural, by strengthening the community's belief--particularly the political and economic sectors of the community--that those who are different are somehow dangerous or inferior.

In the human service's field one approaches a problem in terms of delivery of services to individuals suffering a problem or pathological condition, of a mental or physical sort usually thought of as pathogenic. Since the "medical" model of disease is a socially accepted way of defining significant problems, significant in the sense that they warrant economic investment in their solution, the pathogenic etiological model is the one most often employed in therapeutic services. Success or validation of the program is usually judged in terms of the number of individuals, so labeled, to whom the service has been delivered. In this context solutions to problems are seen in terms of improving the "condition" of the client and/or improving his adaptation to an established environment.

Actually, in recent years, two important perspectives on this service-delivery framework have created unsettling shock waves. One has been the recognition that self-sufficient modes of adaptation were impossible without some modification of the established environment. Thus, the mass publicity campaign to change attitudes toward physically or mentally disabled people vis-a-vis work, or support of architectual changes in the physical environment they live in are examples of this change. The other crisis in the human services field comes from the realization, a depressing and disheartening one, to hard-working well-intentioned professionals, that the professional concept of services, the type of service, and the manner of its delivery may help to perpetuate dependency on the supportive service rather than stimulating self-sufficiency. These two perspectives, particularly the first, have greatly influenced the interpretation, and analysis of results of our research and have been fundamental to the programmatic proposal included here.

If one takes the client-service approach to social disability, the very logic of the approach leads one to locate the disability in the client, and then to ask how the delivery of certain treatment or service will rehabilitate the client, usually through changing the client. Even for a person to "qualify" for the service he must prove his disability, he must see himself as disable and seek the service on that basis. In the case of physical or mental disability, this approach seems reasonable, though some have questions even there. In the case of social disability, however, it must be recognized that the disability effect of certain characteristics is entirely a result of a change in cultural and social environment. Under these circumstances, the individual-client perspective is largely limited to adjustment strategies, the development of techniques that adjust and submit to the prevailing conditions of the environment. When dealing with social disability of a culturally distinctive minority, that individual-client approach contributes to a policy of cultural and social conversion or assimilation of a distinctive aggregate to a prevailing life style. Ultimately, of course, the policy of Federal agencies following this line of thought and action may be the conversion of culturally distinctive minorities to a prevailing and dominant life style.

To seek service, Puerto Ricans, or any other cultural minority may have to conceptualize their own cultural background, their native culture as a social disability. Or, professionals may come to view certain cultural features as antinomous to rehabilitation and seek to persuade the culturally different client to divest himself of that cultural feature in order to fit into an environment dominated by a different cultural code. The effect of agency policies of this order is to break down distinctive ethnic cultures, to erase cultural pluralism as a condition for entry into economically rewarding occupational careers.

There seem to exist three key options to this assimilative approach. One is to modify the environment of work so that a wide range of cultural variations are accommodated within the parameters of profitable productivity. A second and complementary option is the deliberate use of bicultural-bilingual conceptions of adaptation through training, that admit to the idea that clients can become multicultural as well as multilingual, and that deliberately teaches this orientation to cultural-linguistic adaptation to work-related institutions. A third, and very relevant option is the development not only of bilingual but bicultural screening procedures, evaluation models, and rehabilitation plans. These three points summarize the general principles underlying the following recommendations.

One way to illustrate the negative effects of seeing one's primary culture as disabling came about accidentally when the project Director visited the local DVR along with the two gang leaders. Her idea was to gradually acquaint them with the agencies associated with the source of our project funding. The young men were warmly greeted by agency personnel including two of whom were not only bilingual but from Hispanic background. They listened with interest, then talked about the agency. But they talked in terms of the physically or mentally handicapped, as did all the literature the agency had on hand in the office.

After leaving, and over coffee, the two young men were obviously disturbed as well as puzzled. What had their problems with employment and better schools and better living conditions to do with that agency? Were they crippled or mental defects, one asked, because of who they were? I tried to explain that the basis for the connection was not physical, but social disability; i.e., being different and not fitting expectations. Their only response was to ask whether being Puerto Rican made them disabled. Under this hardheaded insight into the Director's, the agency's, and the society's underlying assumptions, the Director admitted that for some things being Puerto Ricans was assumed to be the reason for their being socially disabled in the North American environment. The two young Puerto Rican gang leaders were angry and belligerent for several weeks. The Director went back to the conceptual drawing board.

In this re-examination we developed the view of social disability as lack of "resource redundancy" and rehabilitation as "supportive ameliorative resources." Thus we found that culturally different youth, like Puerto Ricans, who are also from economically marginal homes encounter a number of problem-producing conditions early in their lives, such as academic and behavioral problems with schools, that force them to make key, critical occupational career decisions significantly earlier than would be expected from youth from average, or above average income families (including culturally different as well as culturally similar groups). The point is that economic marginality compounds the effect of cultural difference.

We *do not* propose that average or above income youth are free of problems. It is simply that the decisions they make early in their youth are not as critical to determining their life cycle occupational career. Because the average or above income youth has what we call *resource redundancy*. That is if one solution does not work then the family and the youth have a second chance, or even a third chance.

The notion of "supportive ameliorative resources" refers to the agency's effort to provide or increase "resource redundancy." To illustrate: in the neighborhood youth center when problems arose for the youths the bilingual-bicultural supervisor-counselor, who was there in a multitude of capacities, helped the youths in question to secure or attempt to secure alternative resources, that allowed them alternative solutions to their problems, in particular an alternative to the standard leave-school-get-a-factory-job solution to such problems. In a few instances a new job created serious conflict for some of the youths and they were on the verge of quitting. The center counselor was able to move in at a strategic and appropriate times to give them information, to give them new orientation, and to suggest in one case, supportive training objectives or means.

This report emphasizes that the culture of the Puerto Rican in itself is not a source of disadvantagement. Even cultural difference in itself is not a source of disadvantagement. The disadvantagement arises because the agency's with which cultural and linguistically different groups must deal are not themselves equipped to deal with this separate population. One means of changing that condition is to place in the therapeutic agency staff who are at least *bicultural*, as well as bilingual; are able to adapt screening criteria to culturally different populations and are able to formulate rehabilitative plans that complement the cultural background and even transform the working environment of the client in order to provide effective ameliorative rehabilitation.

Regretably simply hiring native bilinguals from the culturally distinctive background of the client does not assure that the rehabilitative plan will be complementary to the client's background. This was illustrated in a visit of two of the project staff concerning possible referral of one of the sample families because of periodic severe mental disorientation of the mother. The DVR personnel were Spanish-speaking, of Hispanic background. The first step in the plan they suggest, was to disperse the children into foster homes while the mother underwent diagnosis and possible treatment. For a Puerto Rican family breaking up the family probably would be a solution of last resort, even providing the foster homes were those of relatives. Other solutions like housekeepers were not discussed. The case illustrates the fact that rehabilitative plans must also be bicultural if the agency is to successfully ameliorate the ethnic population's problems, without first dissipating its cultural system.

We suggest that the agency personnel become *cultural brokers, who are competent in two cultures*, as well as two languages, *and will employ their bicultural competency* in so far as the agency's services are concerned. The main adaptive objective should probably be the development of work settings that accept biculturalism. Biculturalism also should be developed in vocational training programs. Agency personnel who possess cultural and linguistic competency in Puerto Rican culture, need to have a support base within the agency to help maintain and develop bilingual-bicultural modes of rehabilitative treatment and service.

We found teachers viewed the Puerto Rican's desire to return to the island, a sentiment strongly expressed in our sample by the Puerto Rican parents, as a deterrent to the parent's desire to motivate children to higher educational levels. We did not find that to be the case. But it is true that the desire to return to the island, and the return to the island of approximately thirty percent of the return arrivals, even in a time of low unemployment on the mainland, sets up the need for not only bilingual-bicultural training programs, but *programs and personnel that take into account the occupational structure of the island as well as of the mainland*. This seems the realistic answer to the stereotypical view that the Puerto Rican's dream of returning to the island negatively affects their interest in expending effort on long-term career goals and long-term means for reaching those goals.

Our discovery of the acute ignorance of occupational career information particularly of the vocational rehabilitation concept among, not only youth, but their parents and their teachers, suggests the need to consider the problem of information dispersal. The usual mass media means of increasing that information might be employed, but its effective utilization would be increased, we proposed by "resonance" in natural social networks--like extended families, street gangs, and on a much larger scale, ethnic groups. In previous discussions we have pointed out the important adaptive functions performed by two forms of small groups: the domestic type of group in the Puerto Rican, bilaterally extended family and the voluntary association type of group, for male youths. We recommend these two forms of groups be deliberately utilized in SRS agency rehabilitative training. We propose that programs that utilize existing associational forms of organization will experience a substantial increase in knowledge of and utilization of their resources. We suggest this as a more effective means to improve agency effectiveness than mass media or even *individual* contacts of agency personnel with individual clients.[102]

For Puerto Ricans in particular, we suggest that individualistic selective criteria for screening and evaluating eligibility be modified to allow families as clients for training programs and rehabilitative efforts. Thus, whether the head, or the head's spouse, or youths in the family qualified individually, the entire family would become client to vocational training efforts. The "training" might include not only skill development for one member but improved knowledge of occupational careers, recruitment, entries, stages, and, indeed, the occupational structures in general. Such information when communicated to a natural social network tends to have a "pooling" and "reinforcing" effect. We proposed it will encourage the development of much more informative, communicative significant others in the lives of Puerto Rican youths.[103] Our results showed a near absence of communication with significant others regarding work and occupations.

In addition to recommending selection of domestic groups as clients, we have already emphasized that the gang was a kind of natural network for resonating communications, as well as serving personal needs. We suggest that the use of such natural communication networks as informational networks by deliberate policy will increase the ability of an agency to access, to locate, to train, almost to socialize, a group into the knowledge and utilization of agency resource. We are thinking of services with respect to groups as well as those offered on an individual basis. The gang is the most cohesive voluntarily association for males in the neighborhood. No adult association with the exception of, an older gang, perhaps has the same kind of tight integrative character. The gang members however still were members of households and use of the gang network as an information network to communicate with families for the provision of services also seems a reasonable possibility. Our Center supervisor could very easily have intensified the movement of information regarding available resources that would benefit the families of the members, if he had been called on to do so.

Finally it was clear that the Center supervisor often had the opportunity to talk with the student about cultural conflict problems that were arising in their lives. One of the most salient ones of course was the generation gap, that is, differences between the way parents did things or wanted their children to do things, and the way the children wanted to do. This seemed to offer an opportunity for the development of what might be called bicultural perspective on the part of individual gang members and an occasion when assimilation could be distinguished from the development of competency in a second culture code. This could be a setting for the development of the idea of operating according to more than one culture code. As it was, most of the youths simply saw these experiences as a conflict of good or bad, right or wrong. They were caught up in the feeling that the pattern they preferred, the resolution of a problem, or the conduct that they preferred, which often was closer to the North American culture, was a bad course of action, or thought their parents' proposal was a bad course of action. They did not see the differing views in terms of alternative, culturally-different approaches to similar problems. They did not consider the possibility that they might operate according to one code under certain circumstances and another code under other circumstances. Thus the Center supervisor had an excellent opportunity to develop biculturation, and multicultural adaptive modes, in the youths in the context of the gang. And, we regard such conceptual training and restructuring to be a most critical component of any genuinely rehabilitative program that addresses itself to rehabilitation around social disadvantagement suffered because of the way cultural differences are employed and used in the institutions into which the individuals are entering.

Gang members particularly needed part-time jobs during summer, and they were often provided with part-time jobs by such City agencies as the Urban Progress Centers through various Federal programs that are available. However, it might seem reasonable that these work programs could be shaped into serious efforts at job training programs. Furthermore, one of the points that is clear from the discussion up to this point is that working and jobs are an intimate part of life of the young people in this neighborhood from the earliest years of their lives. Job improvement efforts may well be appropriate to someone younger than seventeen or eighteen years old, because he has already had some job experience and likely has had job failures. Often these failures are due to the marginal pay and the marginality of the job. At the same time, we often observed a propensity toward entrepreneurial kind of work activity that was seldom tapped in jobs or job training that the youths received.

We feel that a gang and a center could be an excellent location for developing such propensities with job-related knowledge and skill. We are suggesting for example that most specific job training programs are specific with respect to a given job or skill. Thus one learns to be a mechanic or to repair television sets, etc. The knowledge that transforms that particular skill into something more than a low-level employee position, is the knowledge of how to start one's own business: of how to keep one's own books, how to make purchase orders, how to make inventories. We feel that the simple job skill itself does not provide sufficient redundancy of opportunity. That is, we propose they should be associated with ancillary skills that will allow one to capture the considerable entrepreneurial skill displayed among many members of the gang.

At a number of points we have noted the serious culture conflict experienced by teenage Puerto Rican girls and early choices of life style, which they are so often forced into. From our own experience we know that any activity oriented program must be sex segregated if it is to be successful with the families of Puerto

Rican girls. We recommend that an occupationally oriented voluntary association be sponsored by SRS, that will incorporate not only young girls who are in the seventh or eighth grade, but high school girls, and those who have dropped out for marriage. The objectives of the association would include improving career information of the members, orientation to rehabilitative job programs, even the sponsorship of such developmental work as day care cooperatives (in conjunction with appropriate professionals), and sponsorship of girls-only-recreational activities. The sponsors or counselors, like such organizations as 4-H clubs, should be a mixture of lay and professional personnel, particularly women from the neighborhood. Whether or not this particular means is employed, we strongly recommend that some active program by SRS be developed for this target popualtion of young Puerto Rican girls and women.

Finally, we recommend that the idea of transitional sheltered workshop be established to develop bilingual-bicultural vocational training programs for Puerto Ricans. Workshops that offered immediate income and other resources, particularly for recent arrivals on the mainland, as well as for families and individual youths who were floundering from the cummulative effects of past failures and institutional discrimination, would be a most powerful adaptive, yet culture maintaining, approach to Puerto Rican vocational needs. If many of the suggestions already mentioned were incorporated into the design of the workshops, we strongly feel they would comprise a new approach to the vocational rehabilitation of culturally different and socially disadvantaged populations, in general, but in particular to Puerto Ricans.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People. Memorandum on text of speech by Dr. Henry M. Ramivez delivered before the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, July 23, 1973.

2. Isidro Lucas, "Final Report: Puerto Rican Dropouts in Chicago: Numbers and Motivations, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Project No. 0-E-108, DHEW, Washington, D. C., 1971.

3. Howard S. Becker and Anselm Strauss, "Career, Personality and Adult Socialization," in Barney Glazer (ed.) Organizational Careers, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1968, pp. 21-34.

4. J. Hernandez-Alvarez, 1968.

5. P. Vivó, 1973.

6. J. Hernandez-Alvarez, 1968.

7. E. Leacock, 1971; S. E. Elam, 1960; N. Glazer and D. Moynihan, 1964.

8. Board of Education of Hoboken, N. J., 1967.

9. F. Bonilla, 1964.

10. M. Gordon, in Assimilation in American Life, 1964, offered one of the first formulations of them as independent of one another. He saw culture change as a stage preceding mobility in social strata. One might also argue that social mobility frees them of the demands of groups that dominate economic resources and political decisions to adopt culture codes of the dominant group while giving up their use of their native culture code.

11. C. Valentine, 1968.

12. Editor, The International Migration Review, 1968.

13. C. Senior, 1956.

14. J. Fennessey, 1967.

15. See Appendix B. This principle of peer language learning is seldom utilized in adult second language classes. Thus one seldom finds mixing of native speakers of the second language with adult learners in an activity-focused situation, used deliberately as an instructional procedure.

16. N. Kantrowitz, 1968.

17. G. C. Myers and G. Masnick, 1968.

18. W. Petersen, 1961.

19. See Fellows, 1972 and Luccas, 1970, in the Bibliography for widely separated studies, both of which emphasized the significance of this factor. Our results led us to regard it as a significant factor that should be seriously taken into account in educational and training programs for Puerto Ricans.

20. J. P. Fitzpatrick, 1966.

21. J. J. Macisco, 1968 and I. Tauber, 1966.

22. J. Mencher, 1958.

23. E. Seda Bonilla, 1958. See also a related study by Anthony Laurie, 1964.

24. S. Bouquet, 1962.

25. M. Opler, 1958; L. Bender and S. Nictern, 1958.

26. B. Berle, 1958.

27. V. Sauna, 1957.

28. E. Padilla, 1958.

29. This is not to deny that in the warm months Puerto Ricans come out on the streets and use them; but the youths are still, even then, under the watchful eye of the family.

30. J. Mencher, 1958.

31. G. O'Neill and N. O'Neill, 1964.

32. Board of Education of Hoboken, N. J., 1967; J. Morrison, 1958; E. Bucchioni, 1965; F. Low, 1957.

33. M. Velazquez, 1964; J. Fennessey, 1967; N. Modiano, 1968; A. Anastasi and C. DeJésus, 1953; Cazden, et. al., 1972; W. Labor, 1972.

34. E. Bucchioni, 1965.

35. E. Gordon and D. Wilkerson, 1966.

36. Haryou, 1964.

37. Peck and Cohen, 1964.

38. J. Morrison, 1958.

39. I. Lucas, 1970.

40. R. Havighurst, 1964.

41. E. Gordon and D. Wilkerson, 1966.

42. Wall Street Journal, January 24, 1968.

43. E. Gordon and D. Wilkerson, 1966.

44. Bureau of Research, Development and Special Projects, 1969.

45. This is a pseudonym used to protect the identity of the school staff.

46. However, it was already clear that staff time that was available during that year was going to be absorbed by the intensive efforts to follow up the families and our student sample. By that time, our sample was increasingly scattered and increasing time was spent in tracking them down in new locations. Thus the Principal's refusal to let researchers into the school during a year of great student unrest probably forced on us earlier a decision we might later have found necessary to make because of lack of time.

47. Regrettably, because the lighting system inside the store was not sufficient to light the big room, we needed the glass in both front windows to permit light to enter and could not board up the glass as many other storefront occupants had done.

48. One tends to use the term "ghetto" with respect to these ethnic and poverty income neighborhoods in large urban areas. I would prefer to use the term "barrio," but it should be recognized "neighborhoods" was used by residents probably more often than the term "barrio," and that "ghetto" was probably used more frequently than "barrio." Their use of "ghetto" may indeed reflect the heavy influence that the black political movement was having on Chicago minority ethnics in general at that time. The Latin Disciples had had some vague connection with the Black Disciples, but it may have been more charismatic than actual or formalized.

49. Hereafter the non-Puerto Ricans will be abbreviated, NPR; the long-term Chicago-resident Puerto Ricans will be designated CPR; and the short-term Chicago-resident Puerto Ricans will be designated PRPR.

50. The term non-formal education is being used by Professor Cole Brembeck and his colleagues at Michigan State University to refer to educational programs outside regular formalized schooling, but which are definitely organized efforts at communicating knowledge and skill and information in pursuit of some training end.

51. David J. Fox, The Research Processes in Education, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

52. Chicago Borad of Education, Report: Student Racial Survey, September, 1968. Chicago, Bureau of Research, Development, Special Projects, 1968.

53. Our pseudonym for the elementary school in which we did our study is The Grammar School. The high school is called Division High School.

54. All tables appear in Appendix A.

55. In this case there were special circumstances involved. A field researcher that had worked with the project prior to SRS funding had established a rather close relationship to this family. She had developed a very close romantic relationship with one of the sons in the family and there were complications about our perhaps discovering this relationship during the course of our contact and interview with the family.

56. A third hypothesis which appeared in the original grant proposal for the first year would have required that we carry out the research in two or more schools. The design was modified so that we confined our attention to one school, and consequently had to drop this working hypothesis:

> The smaller the proportion of Puerto Rican students to North American students in the school, the more the Puerto Rican children of a given school will be like the ethnic majority group, and the less they will be like the Puerto Ricans of other schools in the same district who are in the majority in their school.

57. BEDRES was developed by the personnel of the Chicago Puerto Rican Project, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Jacquetta Hill Burnett, Ph.D., Director.

58. A unique word is different from other words in the corpus. In the sentence "THE MAN BIT THE DOG," there are four unique words: THE, MAN, BIT and DOG. Note that one of the unique words, THE, was used twice.

59. A sentence is defined as that which occurs between any two of the special set of punctuation marks which are both followed by two blanks. Legitimate sentence-ending punctuation marks are periods, question marks and exclamation points.

60. Note that "head" did not always mean "male" head.

61. C. Wright Mills, 1947.

62. O. Lewis, 1968.

63. The fact that our group of families is very like Mills' earlier sample in regard to where they came from is reassuring. Otherwise, on the basis of Lewis's description of his sample, it might be argued that our small group was very atypical of migrating families. To the contrary, it is more likely that the procedure employed by Lewis to select his sample of New York families led to the selection of an atypical sample, so far as background and place of origin is concerned.

64. Hernandez-Alvarez (1968) confirms that between 1950 and 1960 Puerto Ricans arriving on the mainland do not follow the "diaspora" pattern of many other migrant groups including others of Spanish origin such as Cubans.

65. R. Keiser, 1969.

66. Field notes AL 80569, Date 1.

67. Field notes, Op. Cit.

68. We cannot verify this, but the impression there appeared to be a separate decision process going on among the peewees than among the seniors. It is not clear whether the peewees incorporate their own members or whether seniors were always involved. We suspect that they were involved. However, our impression is that the peewees recruit someone to become a member, but the administration and decision regarding the boxing match is carried out by the seniors, one of the main guys in particular. The key requirement to maintain their status in the group is to "come along," that is, to be with the gang often. If they cease to come along then it is understood that they are not wanted anymore.

69. By implication the difference may not be behavioral but may be the terminology used. It may simply be a function of the style of language used to describe the way parents correct a child, rather as much as an actual behavioral difference. On the other hand the language may indeed reflect the fact that the Puerto Rican parents are less physical than the comparison group of NPRs from the same socio-economic status, mainly continental Americans, with some North European ethnics. The point really cannot be further elaborated here, but it does suggest that proper selection of comparison groups for the study of child training practices may be a very productive procedure.

70. J. Mencher, 1958.

71. See the section of "Discussion of Results" for a discussion of the methodological issue involved with this effort to collect culture code data through questionnaires. A fuller exploration of the ethnosemantics of these relationships in the two cultures was certainly warranted. Simple observation and then interview from events described in words are not sufficiently refined in instrumentation to locate precisely the actions that differentiate the relationship in the two cultures.

72. Here again we use the term "ethnic" to refer to those aspects of culture that are involved in contact relationships with other cultures, but not to the total culture code.

73. This interesting result seems irrational on the face of the response, but in our field research we found that many of the PRPRs felt that they had enough command of Spanish so that they did not have to study it in school. Their concentration was on English.

74. E. Hall, 1959.

75. Much more refined instrumentation is needed to locate these, and since this failure, the principal investigator has been working on videotaping of actual interactive events, and using analysis and coding by representatives from the different cultures in question as a first step toward preparing intercultural teaching materials in order to locate the differences.

76. One of these responses came from a recently arrived Puerto Rican girl who was experiencing serious conflicts with her father, her widowed father, over her conduct outside school. Indeed, he was fearful to continue to send her to school after the eighth grade as our subsequent interviews revealed. However, during the time the data was being collected on this question, the girl was forced by the father to return directly home to their apartment from school, to lock the door, and to allow no one in

until the family returned that evening. We knew from indirect evidence that she was about to get into rather serious difficulties and was a candidate for elopement. Thus, from the point of view of keeping her from the cycle of early marriage and early pregnancy, the father, while appearing extraordinarily severe from the point of view of North American perspective, was acting wisely under the circumstances. But it did create a great stress on the young girl and this reflected in a response that in contrast to the rest of the students in the lowest track, she felt she did not spend enough time in school.

77. There was a good deal of conflict between one particular seventh grade teacher and students in the top track of the seventh grade.

78. The closest thing to a good device that is paper and pencil in form is the critical incident methodology employed by Triandis and Malpass in black-white interactions. However, we feel that even that is perhaps in many instances cruder than is desirable and we recommend that new instrumentalities be developed for locating key distances in cultural understanding in specific social settings such as schools.

79. An important point to be made is that while we feel we have located the existence of a cognitive difference between students with most of their experience in North American schools, and students with most of their experience in Puerto Rican schools, the instrumentation that we used at the time we did this research did not allow us to elicit the full coherent, shared PRPR mapping, if indeed it existed in so definite a form. We suspect it did but only a research methodology as refined as ethnosemantic would have allowed us to determine the answer to that question. However, at the time the field work was conducted, the director had not yet recognized the significance of having someone who is expert in this kind of interviewing, and we did not have that expertise available to us.

80. There was a low frequency of response from the PRPR students to this question so we may again be using categorizations and defining features that are unfamiliar to them and thus difficult to respond to.

81. We did not have the time to sort through the responses in terms of the sex of the chooser and the sex of the chosen. However, it may be that we will find on doing this in the future that when boys named boys as the most popular, one of the characteristics that is involved in their being popular in this setting is that they are tough. The sex breakdown on this question suggested this to be the case. The boys were equally divided between saying yes, toughness was involved, and no, toughness was not involved in being popular. But nearly two-thirds of the girls claimed that toughness was not involved in being popular.

82. See Jacquetta Hill Burnett, Human Organization, Vol. 28:1-10, 1969, and James Coleman, The Adolescent Society, 1960.

83. Clearly with such a small sample assessing effects across three ethnic groups and two sex groups simply splits up the frequencies too much to really be able to make a judgment.

84. It should be noted that all of the PRPR respondents to this question are from the two lowest track rooms, and 60% of them are from the lowest track room which was openly and publicly denigrated by both teachers and students. Thus, this response is no news to anyone who had participated in the eighth grade system as it existed that year.

85. The practice of naming groups by the number of the room they are in can be terribly confusing to an outsider when he first enters the school system. It is particularly confounding when people refer back to previous years and to groups that were in certain rooms. But those who participate in the system can remember which classes were in which rooms for several years. A supplementary piece of information that is useful in this respect is to name a group not only by the room number but by the teacher who taught the group that year. This still is not very clarifying to an outsider because of course many of the teachers are still around teaching other groups in other rooms in the ethnographic present in which the researcher is engaging in the conversation. But students are labeled by their room number and by their teacher within the larger system. And we are seeing here how this begins to operate as a system of reference among the students themselves as well as among the teachers. So that when someone refers to 302 as a mob, there is no question in anyone's mind about which group the speaker has in mind, and who is the teacher.

86. The teacher of Room 302 repeatedly refused to allow us to do the self-esteem scores with his classroom group.

87. In the interviews, the interview schedule suggested that the interviewer probe their perspective on the difference between Puerto Rico and Chicago. The probe seemed to work for the CPRs who reported that it was the same in Puerto Rico with respect to how and who should teach children to get along with others. There were, of course, no responses from the NPRs. The PRPRs did not respond readily to the probes to give us information, so that the information is rather incomplete. But it is interesting to note that the CPRs did feel it was the same in Puerto Rico, suggesting that they do not see questions of getting along with others as focused on problems of interethnic relationship.

88. It is regrettable that we did not ask the same question of the teachers in the teacher interview. It would have been interesting

to have been able to compare the parental views on this issue with the professionals' view. On the other hand, it may well be that the professionals were equally divided or were unwilling to adhere to such a generalized rule and would have made it contingent on specific factors.

89. The table on which we are relying reflects frequency of mentions rather than a single response from a given parent. In this instance we could count up to two responses for every parent. Thus, we can consider the responses in terms of ten possible responses from the North American sample, sixteen possible responses from the CPR sample, and fourteen possible responses from the North American sample.

90. The best American English equivalent that we know is a student's being "fresh."

91. In a number of questions which we have asked from the positive side and then from the negative side, we found PRPRs choose not to respond to the negative counterpart of a question. This is particularly the case when one might assume that there would be some kind of strong feeling or shame connected in some way with the phenomenon in question. This is speculative, of course, but we think there is a tendency to avoid discussion of the painful or the negative feelings by PRPR parents.

92. The study of this area indicates that the decoding from non-verbal communication signals are much more culturally specific, but individuals are much less conscious of communicating messages than they are when using verbal communication means, perhaps because verbalization requires the act of cognition. Much attention in the history of culture has been placed on the verbal communication system. This circumstance, that is suggested by the responses of working parents, implies that a study of kinesics, and the use of kinesics as part of the supervisor's repertoire of skills could be a very important part of the supervisor's job training situation, particularly when his or her work included attempting to interact with workers who speak another language than that spoken by the supervisor. This point will be raised again in the discussion of the suggestions and implication of this research for vocational rehabilitation.

93. Since so few respondents gave negative information on what jobs were not available to people like themselves we have not included a table based on that data. Our description is based on only seven of the eighteen respondents. But these responses, on the whole, were what one would expect.

94. L. Roglers and A. B. Hollingshead, 1965.

95. B. Berle, 1958.

96. It should be clear to the reader that we regard the activity of being a housewife as a job. Thus from our point of view a woman who has a family and does not have outside help to come in and help her with that family is holding down two jobs if she works at another job than housekeeping. Thus we include all employed married women in the category of moonlighters. As we suggest, that can be qualified against the amount of assistance that the woman could get either from a spouse or from hired help.

97. J. Woelfel, 1967.

98. Although it is true that some of the young men seem to spend their money on themselves rather than contributing it to the family. There were several cases of this and family members such as sisters often confided in the Center supervisor their disgust with how the youth was spending the money he was earning when the families were in such dire need.

99. G. Suttles, 1968.

100. This was most evident in music, language, the male-female behavior roles but was generally true of the effort to forge compromises and new forms of behavior codes, that of course were particularly relevant to the realities of a poverty level neighborhood.

101. S. Halleck, 1971.

102. An earlier study on Puerto Ricans supported by SRS indicated that diffusion of information through contacts with individual clients, was often a source of confusion and misinterpreted information in the very isolated condition of the Puerto Rican physically disabled population with which he dealt. (See O'Neill and O'Neill, 1964.) In our terms the information was not "resonated" through a natural social network.

103. J. Woelful, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, D. and DeJesús, C. 1953 "Language Development and Non-verbal I.Q. of Puerto Rican Pre-school Children in New York City." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 48(3).

Becker, Howard S. and Strauss, A. L. 1968 "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization." IN B. G. Glaser (ed.) Organizational Careers: A Source Book for Theory. Chicago: Aldin Publishing Company. Pp. 21-35.

Bender, Lauretta and Nictern, Sol 1958 "Two Puerto Rican Boys in New York City." IN G. Seward (ed.) Clinical Studies in Culture Conflict. New York: Ronald Press. Pp. 245-264.

Berkowitz, Elaine 1961 "Family Attitudes and Practices of Puerto Rican and Non-Puerto Rican Pupils." High Points. 43:25-34.

Berle, Beatrice Bishop 1958 Eighty Puerto Rican Families in New York City: Health and Disease Studied in Context. New York: Columbia University Press.

Board of Education of Hoboken, New Jersey 1968 Operation Assimilation through Cultural Understanding. Urbana, Illinois, ERIC Files, University of Illinois, No. ES 001 455. (Or contact Peter Vecchio, 524 Park Ave., Hoboken, N.J. 07030.)

Bonilla, Frank 1964 Rational for a Culturally-Based Program of Action Against Poverty Among New York Puerto Ricans. Urbana, Illinois, ERIC Files, University of Illinois, No. ED 011 543.

Bouquet, Susana 1962 Acculturation of Puerto Rican Children in New York and Their Social Attitudes Towards Negroes and Whites. New York: Columbia University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Bucchioni, Eugene 1965 A Sociological Analysis of the Functioning of Elementary Education for Puerto Rican Children in the New York City Public Schools. New York: New School of Social Research. Doctoral Dissertation.

Bureau of the Census 1974 "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1973," Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Series P-20, No. 264.

Bureau of Research, Development and Special Projects 1969 "Student Racial Survey, September 26, 1969." Chicago: Board of Education of the Chicago Public Schools.

Cazden, Courtney; John, V. P.; and Hymes, D. 1972 Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cordasco, Frank 1963 "Helping the Language Barrier Student." The Instructor. 72:20.

Cordasco, Francesco and Bucchioni, Eugene 1968 Puerto Rican Children in Mainland Schools: A Source Book for Teachers. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Eddy, Elizabeth M. 1967 Walk the White Line.: A Profile of Urban Education. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc.

"Editorial." 1968 The International Migration Review. 2(2):3-4.

Elam, S. L. 1960 "Acculturation and Learning Problems of Puerto Rican Children." Teachers College Record. 61:258-264.

Fellows, Donald 1972 A Mosaic of America's Ethnic Minorities. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Pp. 170-192.

Fennessey, James 1967 "An Exploratory Study of Non-English-speaking Homes and Academic Performance. Urbana, Illinois, ERIC Files, University of Illinois, No. ED 011 613.

Fernandez-Marina, P.; Maldonado, Surra E. D.; and Trent, R. D. 1958 "Three Basic Themes in Mexican and Puerto Rican Family Values." Journal of Social Psychology. 48(2):167-181.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. 1959 "Attitudes of Puerto Ricans Toward Color." The American Catholic Sociological Review. 20:219-233, Fall.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. 1966 "Intermarriage of Puerto Ricans in New York City." The American Journal of Sociology. 71: 395-406.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. 1968 "Puerto Ricans in Perspective: The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland." International Migration Review. 2(2):7-39.

Fox, David J. 1969 The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel P. 1964 "The Puerto Ricans." IN Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press and Harvard University Press. Pp. 86-136.

Goldblatt, Harold and Tyson, Cyril 1962 "Some Self-perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades." (Public School 198m, City Commission on Human Rights of New York) Urbana, Illinois, ERIC Files, University of Illinois, No. ED 001 776.

Goodman, Samuel M.; Diamond, Lorrain K.; and Fox, David J. 1956 "Who are the Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public Schools?" Puerto Rican Study Research Report. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Wilkerson, Doxey A. 1966 Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices, Preschool Through College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Gordon, Milton 1964 Assimilation in American Life: The Rule of Race, Religion and National Origins. New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, Helen 1960 "Comparison of Nurturance and Independence. Training in Jamaica and Puerto Rico, with Consideration of the Resulting Personality Structure and Transplanted Social Patterns." Journal of Social Patterns. Journal of Social Psychology. 51:27-63.

Hall, Edward 1959 The Silent Language. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Halleck, Seymour 1971 The Politics of Therapy. New York: Science House, Inc.

Handlin, Oscar 1959 The Newcomers--Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited 1964 Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change. New York: Century Printing Co.

Havighurst, Robert 1964 The Public Schools of Chicago. Chicago: Board of Education of the City of Chicago.

Hernandez-Alverez, J. 1968 "The Movement and Settlement of Puerto Rican Migrants within the United States, 1950-1960." International Migration Review. 2(2):40-51.

Icken-Safa, Helen 1962 Shanty Town to Public Housing: Comparison of Two Urban Neighborhoods in Puerto Rico. New York: Columbia University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Ingram, William and Wolter, Doris 1965 "Health and Urban Environment." Archives of Environmental Health. 10:358-360.

Kantrowitz, Nathan 1968 "Social Mobility of Puerto Ricans: Education, Occupation, and Income Change Among Children of Migrants, New York, 1950-1960." International Migration Review. 2(2):53-71.

Keiser, R. Lincoln 1969 The Vice Lords: Warriors of the Streets. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Labor, William 1972 Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Landy, David 1959 Tropical Childhood: Cultural Transmission and Learning in a Rural Puerto Rican Village. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Lauria, Anthony 1964 "Respeto, Relajo, and Interpersonal Relations in Puerto Rico." Anthro Quarterly. 36:53-67.

Leacock, Eleanor (ed.) 1971 The Culture of Poverty: A Critique. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lewis, Claudia 1966 "Some Puerto Rican Viewpoints." Childhood Education. 43:82-84.

Lewis, Oscar 1966 La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty--San Juan and New York. New York: Random House.

Lewis, Oscar 1968 A Study of Slum Culture: Background for La Vida. New York: Random House.

Low, Frances 1957 School-Puerto Rican Parent Relations, 1955-56: The Puerto Rican Study. New York: The Board of Education of the City of New York.

Lucas, Isidro 1971 Puerto Rican Dropouts in Chicago: Numbers and Motivations. Final Report: Project No. 0-E-108, Bureau of Research, U.S.O.E., DHEW, Washington, D.C.

Maciseo, John J. 1968 "Assimilation of the Puerto Ricans on the Mainland." International Migration Review. 2(2):21-39.

Mencher, Joan P. 1958 Child Rearing and Family Organization Among Puerto Ricans in Eastville, El Barrio de Nueva York. New York: Columbia University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Mills, C. Wright; Senior, Clarence; and Goldsen, Rose 1950 The Puerto Rican Journey--New York's Newest Migrants. New York: Harper.

Modiano, Nancy 1968 A Comparative Study of Two Approaches to the Teaching of Reading in the National Language. New York: New York University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Morrison, J. Cayce 1958 The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-57: A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York: The Puerto Rican Study. New York: New York City Board of Education.

Myers, George C. and Masnick, George 1968 "The Migration Experience of New York Puerto Ricans: A Perspective on Return." International Migration Review. 2(2):80-89.

O'Neill, George C. and O'Neill, Nena 1964 "Pilot Study of Vocational Rehabilitation Needs of Puerto Ricans of Employable Age." Research Report: RD-1439-G-64; VRA-DHEW. New York: Puerto Rican Social Services, Inc.

Opler, Marvin K. 1958 "Dilemmas of Two Puerto Rican Men." IN Georgene Seward (ed.) Clinical Studies in Culture Conflict. New York: Ronald Press. Pp. 223-244.

Padilla, Elena 1958 Up From Puerto Rico. New York: Columbia University Press.

Petersen, William 1961 Population. New York: MacMillon. Pp. 95.

Pobete, Renato 1960 "Anomie and the Quest for Community: The Formation of Sects Among the Puerto Ricans of New York." American Catholic Review. 21:18-36.

Rand, Christopher 1958 The Puerto Ricans. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Robert E. T. 1965 Chicago's Ethnic Groups. Urban Church Planning: Chicago Lutheran Planning Study, Vol. I. Chicago: National Lutheran Council.

Rogler, Lloyd H. 1969 "To Be or Not to Be Political: A Dilemma of Puerto Rican Migrant Associations." IN E. B. Brody (ed.) Behavior in New Environments. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Saye Publications. Pp. 425-436.

Rogler, Lloyd and Hollingshead 1965 Trapped: Families and Schizophrenia. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rosner, Milton S. 1957 A Study of Contemporary Patterns of Aspirations and Achievements of the Puerto Ricans of Hell's Kitchen. New York: New York University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Rubin, Morris 1963 "Student Interpretors for Newcomers." Strengthening Democracy. 16(1):3-8.

Sanua, Victor D., et. al. 1957 "The Vocational Rehabilitation Problems of Disabled Puerto Ricans in New York City." Rehabilitation Monograph, XII, New York, New York University--Bellevue Medical Center.

Schaefer, Dorothy 1967 "Prejudice in Negro and Puerto Rican Adolescents." IN Robert Dentler, et. al (eds.) The Urban "R's:" Race Relations as a Problem in Urban Education. New York City: Center for Urban Education.

Seda Bonilla, Eduardo 1958 Normative Patterns of the Puerto Rican Family in Various Situational Contexts. New York: Columbia University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Senior, Clarence 1965 The Puerto Ricans: Strangers-Then-Neighbors. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Senior, Clarence 1956 "The Puerto Rican in the United States." IN Joseph H. Gittler (ed.) Understanding Minority Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo 1965 Spanish Harlem. New York: Harper and Row.

Stambler, Ada 1958 A Study of Eighth Grade Puerto Rican Students at Junior High School 65, Manhattan, with Implications for their Placement, Grouping and Orientation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Universtiy. Doctoral Dissertation.

Stycos, J. K. 1952 "Family and Fertility in Puerto Rico." American Sociological Review. 17:572-580.

Suttles, Gerald D. 1968 The Social Order of the Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tauber, Irene 1966 "Migration and Transformation: Spanish Surname Populations and Puerto Ricans." Population Index. 32(1):3-34.

Thomas, Piri 1967 Down These Mean Streets. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Valentine, Charles 1968 Culture and Poverty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Velazquez, Mary D. Rivera de 1964 A Contrastive Analysis of Puerto Rican Spanish and American English with Applications to the Teaching of English as a Second Language to Puerto Ricans. Bloomington, Indiana; Indiana University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Vivó, Paquita 1973 The Puerto Ricans: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: R. R. Bowker Co.

Wakefield, Dan 1959 Island in the City: The World of Spanish Harlem. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Willis, Robert 1961 An Analysis of the Adjustment and Scholastic Achievement of Forty Puerto Rican Boys Who Attended Transition Classes in New York City. New York: New York University. Doctoral Dissertation.

Woelfel, Joseph 1967 "A Paradigm for Research on Significant Others." Paper presented before joint sessions of The American Sociological Association and The Society for the Study of Social Problems. San Francisco, California.

Wolf, Kathleen L. 1953 "Growing Up and Its Price in Three Puerto Rican Subcultures." Psychiatry. 15:401-433.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1. THE SOCIOMETRY OF ETHNICITY AMONG STUDENTS

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 7.1.0 Non-school instruction received.				
N.A.	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	10.5 (2)
No	85.7 (6)	100.0 (6)	83.3 (5)	89.5 (17)
Total	(7)	(6)	(6)	(19)
Q. 7.3.0 Do you play a musical instrument?				
N.A.	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	10.5 (2)
Yes	28.6 (2)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	21.1 (4)
No	57.1 (4)	83.3 (5)	66.7 (4)	68.4 (13)
Total	(7)	(6)	(6)	(19)
Q. 10.3.0 What do you do when you encounter someone you dislike or don't get along with?				
N.A.	28.6 (2)			28.6 (2)
Ignore them	57.1 (4)			57.1 (4)
Chase them away	14.3 (1)			14.3 (1)
Totals	(7)			(7)
Q. 11.0.1 Ethnicity of person you'd recommend as friend (1st choice)				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	22.2 (4)
Puerto Rican	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	44.4 (8)
Non-Puerto Rican	83.3 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	27.8 (5)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.6 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)

Table 1. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 11.1.1 Ethnicity of person from your school you'd recommend as friend.				
N.A., none	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	83.3 (5)	44.5 (8)
Puerto Rican	16.7 (1)	66.7 (4)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (6)
Non-Puerto Rican	66.7 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 12.1.0 Do you like most North Americans?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.2 (2)
Yes	83.3 (5)	66.7 (4)	83.3 (5)	77.8 (14)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.6 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 12.2.0 Do you like most Puerto Ricans?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	94.4 (17)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 12.2.0 Why do you like most Puerto Ricans?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	22.2 (4)
They are my own kind	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	38.9 (7)
They are the same as other people	33.3 (2)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Some are my friends	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Some are bad, some O.K.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)

Table 1. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 13.1.0 Do you have North American friends?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	83.3 (5)	100.0 (6)	88.8 (16)
No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 13.1.1 North Americans among best friends.				
N.A.	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	27.8 (5)
Among best friends	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Not among best friends	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	38.9 (7)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	11.1 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 13.2.0 Do you have Puerto Rican friends?				
Yes	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (18)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)
Q. 13.2.1 Puerto Ricans among best friends.				
N.A.	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	27.8 (5)
Among best friends	33.3 (2)	76.7 (4)	50.0 (3)	50.0 (9)
Not among best friends	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (3)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)

Table 1. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
SELF ESTEEM SCORES - 1969				
General self-esteem score				
N	6	5	2	13
Range	13-21 (9)	11-23 (13)	12-18 (7)	11-23 (13)
$\overline{X}$	17.1	16.6	15.0	16.6
Defensiveness score				
N	6	5	2	13
Range	4-7 (4)	4-8 (5)	4 (0)	4-8 (5)
$\overline{X}$	5.6	5.8	5.4	5.4
Social self-peers				
N	6	5	2	13
Range	4-7 (4)	2-8 (7)	4-5 (2)	2-8 (7)
$\overline{X}$	6.1	5.0	4.5	5.4
Home-parents				
N	6	5	2	13
Range	3-7 (5)	4-8 (5)	2-7 (6)	2-8 (7)
$\overline{X}$	5.1	4.6	4.5	4.8
School-academic				
N	6	5	2	13
Range	2-6 (5)	4-7 (4)	1-5 (5)	1-7 (7)
$\overline{X}$	4.3	4.8	3.0	4.3

Table 2. STUDENTS' VIEWS ON PARENTAL STRICTNESS AND CONTROL OF SPATIAL FREEDOM

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 4.1 Adult strictness at home.				
Yes	66.7 (4)	100.0 (5)	66.7 (4)	76.5 (13)
No	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	23.5 (4)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 4.2 Form of strictness				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	66.7 (4)	31.3 (5)
Scolding, punishment	66.7 (4)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	31.3 (5)
Correction	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	25.0 (4)
Other	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)
Total	(6)	(4)	(6)	(16)
Q. 6.01 Get along best with which parent.				
N.A.	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Mother	28.6 (2)	60.0 (3)	100.0 (6)	61.1 (11)
Father	42.9 (3)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Both equally	14.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(7)	(5)	(6)	(18)
Q. 6.02 Why is it easier to get along with that parent?				
N.A.	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	11.1 (2)
Less strict	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	11.1 (2)
More fun than other	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
More understanding than other	28.6 (2)	60.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (6)
More reasonable, rational than other	14.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
More cooperative than other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	11.1 (2)
Other	14.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (3)
Total	(7)	(5)	(6)	(18)

Table 2. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 6.1.0 Is one parent more strict than the other?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.9 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	52.9 (9)
No	33.3 (2)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	41.2 (7)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 6.1.1 Which is stricter parent?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	23.5 (4)
Mother stricter	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Father stricter	50.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	41.2 (7)
Both equally strict	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	29.4 (5)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 8.3.0/8.3.1 Older sister as chaperone.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	17.7 (3)
Yes	33.3 (2)	60.0 (3)	83.3 (5)	58.8 (10)
No	66.7 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.5 (4)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 8.3.2 Younger sister as chaperone.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	50.0 (3)	41.2 (7)
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.9 (1)
No	100.0 (6)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	52.9 (9)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 8.3.3 Older brother as chaperone.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	33.3 (2)	35.3 (6)
Yes	50.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	41.2 (7)
No	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	23.5 (4)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)

Table 2. Cont.

		Chicago Puerto		
Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 8.3.4 Younger brother as chaperone.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	50.0 (3)	41.2 (7)
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.9 (1)
No	100.0 (6)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	52.9 (9)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 9.1.0 Can a girl attend events with a boy?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (4)	23.5 (4)
Maybe	16.7 (1)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	23.5 (4)
Yes: school events, movies, parties	83.3 (5)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	41.2 (7)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 10.1.0 Are you allowed out without supervision?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Yes	100.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	70.6 (12)
No	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	23.5 (4)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)
Q. 10.4.0 At what age permitted out.				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	29.4 (5)
10-12	50.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	29.4 (5)
13-14	16.7 (1)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	29.4 (5)
19-20	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.9 (1)
Above 20	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)

Table 2. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 17.0.0 Should boys be chaperoned?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	11.8 (2)
No	100.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	76.4 (13)
Total	(6)	(5)	(6)	(17)

Table 3. STUDENTS' VIEWS ON CULTURE CODING OF SOCIAL RELATIONS AND ON OCCUPATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 22.1.0 Is joking around acceptable between two boys?				
Yes	83.3 (5)	50.0 (3)	100.0 (7)	78.9(15)
No	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	21.1 (4)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 22.3.0 Is joking around acceptable between two girls?				
Yes	83.3 (5)	66.7 (4)	71.4 (5)	73.7(14)
No	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (2)	26.3 (5)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 22.5.0 Is joking around acceptable between a boy and a girl?				
Yes	100.0 (6)	83.3 (5)	71.4 (5)	84.2(16)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.5 (2)
Uncertain	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 23.0.0 How do you address the teacher?				
By name	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	85.7 (6)	94.7(18)
"Teacher"	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 23.1.0 Why do you so address the teacher?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
A sign of respect	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	42.9 (3)	52.5(10)
School rules	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Requested use of name	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
Immature to say "Teacher"	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)

Table 3. Cont.

Questions			Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
		It's polite	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
		Sounds better	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
		Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (3)	15.7 (3)
		Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q.	27.0.0	When teacher is talking to you, do you look straight at him?				
		Yes	83.3 (5)	100.0 (6)	85.7 (6)	89.5(17)
		No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.5 (2)
		Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q.	27.2.0	When teacher is talking to you, do you look down?				
		Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.5 (2)
		No	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	71.4 (5)	89.5(17)
		Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q.	27.3.0	When teacher is talking to you, do you look all around?				
		Yes	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	21.1 (4)
		No	66.7 (4)	100.0 (6)	71.4 (5)	78.9(15)
		Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q.	28.1.0	Is joking around acceptable between a male teacher and a male student?				
		Yes	100.0 (6)	50.0 (3)	28.6 (2)	57.9(11)
		No	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	71.4 (5)	42.1 (8)
		Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q.	28.2.0	Is joking around acceptable between a female teacher and a female student?				
		N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)

Table 3. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Yes	100.0 (6)	66.7 (4)	42.9 (3)	68.4(13)
	No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	57.1 (4)	26.3 (5)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 28.3.0	Is joking around acceptable between a male teacher and a female student?				
	Yes	100.0 (6)	66.7 (4)	14.3 (1)	57.9(11)
	No	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	85.7 (6)	42.1 (8)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 28.4.0	Is joking around acceptable between a female teacher and a male student?				
	Yes	100.0 (6)	83.3 (5)	42.9 (3)	73.7(14)
	No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	57.1 (4)	26.3 (5)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 28.5.0	Is joking around acceptable between a teacher and a parent?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	Yes	66.7 (4)	50.0 (3)	42.9 (3)	52.6(10)
	No	33.3 (2)	16.7 (1)	57.1 (4)	36.9 (7)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 29.0.0	What are best jobs and occupations (U.S. Census categories; number of mentions).				
	Professional, technical	42.8 (3)	80.0 (4)	14.3 (1)	42.2 (8)
	Clerical, sales	28.6 (2)	20.1 (1)	28.6 (2)	26.3 (5)
	Craftsman, foreman	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.5 (2)
	Operators	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.5 (2)
	Non-household service workers	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(7)	(5)	(7)	(19)

Table 3. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 29.0.0	What are best jobs and occupations (Specific; number of mentions).				
	Lawyer, doctor	42.8 (3)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
	Teacher, nurse, librarian	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	20.0 (4)
	Detective, policeman, fireman	14.3 (1)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	15.0 (3)
	Office worker	28.6 (2)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	25.0 (5)
	Factory worker	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.0 (1)
	Other	14.3 (1)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	15.0 (3)
	Total	(7)	(8)	(5)	(20)
Q. 30.1.0	What kind of help do you need?				
	N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (2)	21.0 (4)
	Financial	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Opportunity for college and further education	66.7 (4)	50.0 (3)	14.3 (1)	42.1 (8)
	Learn a lot in school	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (2)	21.0 (4)
	Help finding a job	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 31.1.0	Have you received help?				
	N.A.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (2)	21.0 (4)
	Yes	66.7 (4)	83.3 (5)	28.6 (2)	57.9(11)
	No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	15.8 (3)
	Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 31.2.0	Has the school helped you?				
	N.A.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	16.7 (3)
	Yes	50.0 (3)	83.3 (5)	16.7 (1)	50.0 (9)
	No	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (4)	33.3 (6)
	Total	(6)	(6)	(6)	(18)

Table 3. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 31.3.0 Do you want help?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	14.3 (1)	15.8 (3)
Yes	50.0 (3)	83.3 (5)	71.4 (5)	68.4(13)
Don't need any	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	15.8 (3)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)
Q. 32.1.0 Consequences of dropping out of school (number of mentions)				
Won't get a good job	54.5 (6)	33.3 (4)	18.2 (2)	35.3(12)
Won't get a good enough education or learn anything	0.0 (0)	8.3 (1)	36.3 (4)	14.7 (5)
Miserable life, won't earn enough	27.3 (3)	25.0 (3)	27.3 (3)	26.5 (9)
Won't keep a job	9.1 (1)	16.7 (2)	18.2 (2)	14.7 (5)
Other	9.1 (1)	16.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	8.8 (3)
Total	(11)	(12)	(11)	(34)
Q. 33.1.0 Girls' chances of a good job if she drops out.				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (1)	16.7 (3)
Won't get a job that pays enough	16.7 (1)	20.0 (1)	57.1 (4)	33.3 (6)
Same as for a boy	16.7 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (1)	16.7 (3)
Doesn't matter after she marries	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Other	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	16.7 (3)
Total	(6)	(5)	(7)	(18)
Q. 34.0.0 Does finishing 8th grade help one get a better job?				
N.A., D.K	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	50.0 (3)	28.6 (2)	52.6(10)
Not at all, not much	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	57.1 (4)	42.1 (8)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)

Table 3. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 35.0.0 Does finishing 2nd year of high school help one get a better job?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.3 (1)
Yes	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	57.1 (4)	84.2(16)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.5 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(7)	(19)

Table 4. STUDENTS' VIEWS OF ETHNICITY IN THE SCHOOL

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 36.0.0 Is there anything you like about school?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Yes	60.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	80.0 (4)	64.3 (9)
No	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 37.0.0 Is there anything you dislike about school?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
Yes	80.0 (4)	75.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	57.1 (8)
No	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 37.2.0 Valence of tone of response about school.				
Positive	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (7)
Neutral	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Negative	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	35.7 (5)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 38.2.0 School grade liked best.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
5th grade	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
6th grade	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	35.7 (5)
7th grade	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
8th grade	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	35.7 (5)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4 Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 39.2.0 School grade liked least.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.5 (3)
1st grade	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
2nd grade	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
5th grade	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
7th grade	80.0 (4)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (6)
8th grade	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 40.0.0 Frequency of parental visits to school.				
Often	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Seldom	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	57.1 (8)
Never	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.1.0 Do parents visit school because of your behavior problems?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Yes	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
No	80.0 (4)	75.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	78.6 (11)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.2.0 Do they visit to keep up with what is going on in school?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 41.2.0 (cont'd.)				
No	100.0 (5)	100.0 (4)	40.0 (2)	78.6 (11)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.3.0 Do they visit for programs and special events?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.2 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
No	60.0 (3)	75.) (3)	80.0 (4)	71.4 (10)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.4.0 Do they visit because of requests from the teacher or principal?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	42.9 (6)
No	60.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (7)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.5.0 Do they visit for other reasons?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.2 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	35.7 (5)
No	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	57.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 41.5.0 Other specific reasons for parental visits to school.				
N.A.	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	71.5 (10)
To inquire about high school	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
To explain an absence	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 41.5.0 (cont'd)				
They are "nosey"	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 42.1.0 Is it your mother who visits the school?				
Usually	60.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	35.7 (5)
Seldom	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
Never	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	42.9 (6)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 42.2.0 Is it your father who visits the school?				
Usually	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)
Seldom	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Never	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	80.0 (4)	57.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 42.3.0 Is it your mother and father together who visit the school?				
Seldom	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Never	80.0 (4)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (5)	92.9 (13)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 43.1.0 Is joking around acceptable between a father and son?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Yes	100.0 (5)	75.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	78.6 (11)
No	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 43.2.0	Is joking around acceptable between a mother and son?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.2 (1)
	Yes	100.0 (5)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	71.4 (10)
	No	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 43.3.0	Is joking around acceptable between a father and daughter?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
	Yes	100.0 (5)	100.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	71.4 (10)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 44.1.0a	Sex of most popular students in school.				
	N.A.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
	Male	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
	Female	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
	Both sexes mentioned	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 44.1.0b	Grade of most popular students in school.				
	N.A.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
	8th grade	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	71.4 (10)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

		Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q.	44.1.0c	Ethnic identification of most popular students in school.				
		N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
		Puerto Rican or Spanish surname	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	71.4 (10)
		Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q.	44.1.0d	Room number of most popular students in school.				
		N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	21.5 (3)
		315	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	35.8 (5)
		117	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
		301	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
		118	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
		302	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
		12	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
		Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q.	44.2.0a	Sex of most popular students in 8th grade.				
		N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
		Male	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
		Female	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
		Both sexes mentioned	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
		Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q.	44.2.0b	Ethnic identity of most popular student in 8th grade.				
		N.A., D.K	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
		Puerto Rican or Spanish surname	80.0 (4)	75.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	71.4 (10)
		Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 44.2.0c Room number of most popular students in 8th grade.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
315	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	35.8 (5)
117	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
301	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
302	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Combination of above	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 44.3.0a Sex of most popular student in respondents' room.				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Male	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	21.4 (3)
Female	20.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Both sexes mentioned	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 44.3.0b Ethnic identity of most popular student in respondents' room.				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Puerto Rican or Spanish surname	40.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	60.0 (3)	64.3 (9)
Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 45.1.0 Are these popular students the smartest?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	7.1 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	60.0 (3)	42.9 (6)
No	60.0 (3)	75.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (7)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 45.2.0	Are these popular students the hardest workers?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	21.4 (3)
	Yes	40.0 (2)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (7)
	No	60.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 45.3.0	Are these popular students the best behaved?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
	Yes	60.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	42.9 (6)
	No	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	42.8 (6)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 45.4.0	Are these popular students the athletes?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	42.9 (6)
	No	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	40.0 (2)	42.9 (6)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 45.5.0	Are these popular students the toughest?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	21.4 (3)
	Yes	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
	No	60.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (7)
	Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 45.6.0 Are these popular students the leaders?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
Yes	100.0 (5)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (6)
No	0.0 (0)	75.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	42.8 (6)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 45.7.0 Are these popular students the best looking?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
Yes	60.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	42.9 (6)
No	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	35.7 (5)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 46.0.0 Do teachers like these popular students better than others?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
Yes	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
No	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	35.7 (5)
Uncertain	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	35.7 (5)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 47.0.0 Are students in one room better than in another?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	21.4 (3)
Yes	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	50.0 (7)
No	40.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 48.0.0 Which 8th grade room is the best?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
315	60.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	42.9 (6)
117	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
301	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
118	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Other	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 48.1.0 Why is that room the best?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	14.3 (2)
Best behaved	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
More intelligent	80.0 (4)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	42.9 (6)
Best teacher	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.5 (3)
Most fun	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Like it	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 49.0.0 How are students in your room at doing schoolwork?				
Very good	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	21.4 (3)
Good	40.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (7)
Not so good	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(4)	(14)
Q. 50.0.0 How are students in your room at making good grades?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1.(1)
Very good	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	21.4 (3)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Good	20.0 (1)	100.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	42.9 (6)
Not so good	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 51.0.0 Comparison of respondents' room to others on behavior.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	14.3 (2)
Poorer	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	21.4 (3)
As good	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	35.7 (5)
Better	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 52.0.0 Are you like others in your room?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Yes	60.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (7)
No	20.0 (1)	50.0 (2)	60.0 (3)	42.9 (6)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 53.0.0 Opinion of this school compared with other schools.				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	35.7 (5)
Positive	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	28.6 (4)
Neutral	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Negative	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	28.6 (4)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 4. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 54.0.0 Are there advantages to being Puerto Rican in this school?				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	75,0 (3)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (7)
Yes	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	42.9 (6)
No	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)
Q. 56.1.0 Are there some in school who don't like Puerto Ricans?				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
Yes	60.0 (3)	75.) (3)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (6)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	100.0 (5)	35.7 (5)
Total	(5)	(4)	(5)	(14)

Table 5. STUDENTS' EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 57.0.0 Preferred language.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.6 (1)
Prefer Spanish	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	42.9 (3)	22.2 (4)
Prefer English	60.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	14.3 (1)	44.4 (8)
Like both	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (2)	27.8 (5)
Total	(5)	(6)	(7)	(18)
Q. 58.1.0 Language used with mother.				
English	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.3 (5)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	66.7 (4)	75.0 (6)	52.6(10)
Both	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	12.5 (1)	15.8 (3)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 58.2.0 Language used with father.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
English	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	42.1 (8)
Both	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	21.1 (4)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 58.3.0 Language used with older siblings.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
English	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.3 (5)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	26.3 (5)
Both	0.0 (0)	83.3 (5)	25.0 (2)	36.9 (7)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 58.4.0 Language used with same age siblings.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
English	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	21.1 (4)
Both	0.0 (0)	100.0 (6)	25.0 (2)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 58.5.0 Language used with younger siblings.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
English	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
Both	0.0 (0)	100.0 (6)	37.5 (3)	47.4 (9)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 59.0.0 Exclusive use of English with anyone in household.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
Yes	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	25.0 (2)	36.8 (7)
No	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	62.5 (5)	47.4 (9)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 59.1.0 With whom in household is English exclusively used?				
No one	100.0 (5)	50.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	68.4(13)
Father	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Siblings	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	25.0 (2)	21.7 (4)
Friends and others	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 60.0.0a Do you translate for anyone?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
Yes	0.0 (0)	83.3 (5)	62.5 (5)	52.6(10)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	36.9 (7)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 60.0.0b For whom do you act as translator?				
N.A.	100.0 (5)	16.7 (1)	37.5 (3)	47.4 (9)
Parents	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	21.1 (4)
Siblings	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Neighbors, friends	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
Other relatives	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	25.0 (2)	15.8 (3)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 61.0.0 Would you like to study Spanish?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	66.7 (4)	62.5 (5)	57.9(11)
No	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	25.0 (2)	26.3 (5)
Uncertain	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 62.0.0 Do you like to read in Spanish?				
Yes	20.0 (1)	66.7 (4)	87.5 (7)	63.2(12)
No	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Can't read Spanish	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 63.1.0 Do you know how to write in Spanish?				
Not at all	100.0 (5)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	36.9 (7)
A little	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	21.1 (4)
Very well	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	87.5 (7)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 64.2.0 Do you like to read in English?				
Yes	100.0 (5)	100.0 (6)	87.5 (7)	94.7(18)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 65.0.0 Do you prefer to read in English or in Spanish?				
N.A.	80.0 (4)	33.3 (2)	37.5 (3)	47.4 (9)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
Like both	20.0 (1)	66.7 (4)	37.5 (3)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 66.0.0 Do you prefer to write in English or in Spanish?				
English	100.0 (5)	83.3 (5)	50.0 (4)	73.7(14)
Spanish	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	50.0 (4)	26.3 (5)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 67.1.0 Is English necessary to do well in school?				
Yes	100.0 (5)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (8)	100.0(19)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 67.3.0 Is English necessary for going to college?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Yes	100.0 (5)	83.3 (5)	100.0 (8)	94.7(18)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 67.5.0 Is English necessary for getting a good job?				
Yes	100.0 (5)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (8)	100.0(19)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 69.0.0 Easiest way for you to learn English:				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	21.0 (4)
Speaking it with native speakers.	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
Watching T.V.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Taking lessons	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Go to school	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	37.5 (3)	26.3 (5)
Just study	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
Using records	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 70.1.0 Have you studied English in TESL?				
Yes	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	100.0 (8)	57.9(11)
No	80.0 (4)	66.7 (4)	0.0 (0)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 72.1.0 Would you like to study some subjects in Spanish?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	75.0 (6)	52.6(10)
No	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 72.2.0 What subjects would you like to study in Spanish?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	25.0 (2)	21.0 (4)

Table 5. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Science	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Math	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	36.8 (7)
	Social studies	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Spelling	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	Gym	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	None	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 74.1.0	Do you like the students you go to school with?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	66.7 (4)	100.0 (8)	84.2(16)
	Some of them	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 75.1.0	Do most schoolmates speak Spanish only?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.2 (1)
	Yes	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	62.5 (5)	31.6 (6)
	No	80.0 (4)	66.7 (4)	12.5 (1)	47.4 (9)
	Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	25.0 (2)	15.8 (3)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 76.0.0	Do most schoolmates speak both Spanish and English?				
	N.A.	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	36.8 (7)
	Yes	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	50.0 (4)	47.4 (9)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Some of them	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 77.0.0 Are you treated the same as others by fellow students?				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	25.0 (2)	26.3 (5)
Yes	40.0 (2)	83.3 (5)	62.5 (5)	63.2(12)
No	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 78.0.0 Are teachers ever critical of you for being absent?				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	21.1 (4)
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
No	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	57.9(11)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 79.0.0 Does being absent affect your grades?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	15.8 (3)
Yes	20.0 (1)	66.7 (4)	62.5 (5)	52.6(10)
No	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 80.0.0 Why are you usually absent?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	12.5 (1)	21.0 (4)
Illness	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	36.9 (7)
Illness and don't feel like going	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	15.8 (3)
Work at home	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	37.5 (3)	21.0 (4)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 81.0.0	Opinion of amount of time you spend in school:				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	25.0 (2)	26.3 (5)
	Too much	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	36.9 (7)
	Enough	20.0 (1)	66.7 (4)	0.0 (0)	26.3 (5)
	Too little	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 82.0.0	Do you read a newspaper?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	83.3 (5)	87.5 (7)	84.2(16)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 82.4.0	Frequency of newspaper reading.				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	31.5 (6)
	Everyday	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	15.8 (3)
	Once a week or less	60.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	50.0 (4)	47.4 (9)
	Never	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 83.0.0	Do you have a radio?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	50.0 (3)	87.5 (7)	73.7(14)
	No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	12.5 (1)	10.5 (2)
	Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 83.2.0	Do you listen to the radio?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	66.7 (4)	87.5 (7)	78.9(15)

Table 5. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 84.0.0 Do you enjoy school this year?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
Yes	60.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	62.5 (5)	63.2(12)
No	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	21.0 (4)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 84.1.0 Do you enjoy school more or less than last year?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	25.0 (2)	26.3 (5)
More	60.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	37.5 (3)	52.6(10)
Less	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	21.1 (4)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)
Q. 85.1.0 Do you like schoolwork more or less than last year?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	12.5 (1)	21.1 (4)
More	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	31.6 (6)
Less	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
About the same	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	75.0 (6)	36.8 (7)
Total	(5)	(6)	(8)	(19)

Table 6. STUDENTS' EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY AND REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL WORK IN THE HOME

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 86.1.0	Do you ever do homework on weekday evenings?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	16.7 (1)	35.7 (5)
	Never	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	14.3 (2)
	Frequently	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	21.4 (3)
	Always	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (4)
	Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 88.1.0	Where do you usually do your studying?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	28.6 (4)
	Living room	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (4)
	Kitchen	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
	Own room	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
	In school	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
	Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 88.2.0	Where do you prefer to study?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	14.3 (2)
	Living room	66.7 (2)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	35.7 (5)
	Dining room	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	7.1 (1)
	Own room	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (4)
	In school	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	14.3 (2)
	Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 88.3.0a	Is radio playing during study?				
	N.A.	33.3 (1)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	42.9 (6)
	Yes	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	50.0 (7)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	7.1 (1)
	Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 88.3.0b	Is T.V. going during study?				
	Yes	33.3 (1)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	50.0 (7)
	No	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	50.0 (7)
	Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)

Table 6. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 89.0.0 Do you listen to radio while studying?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
Seldom, never	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	66.7 (4)	42.9 (6)
Usually	100.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	35.7 (5)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 90.0.0 Do you watch T.V. while studying?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
Yes	100.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (3)	50.0 (7)
No	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (4)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 91.1.0 Do you ever request that T.V. be turned down or off during studying?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	35.7 (5)
Yes	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	35.6 (4)
No	66.7 (2)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	35.7 (5)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 91.2.0 Does family comply with request to turn T.V. down or off?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	33.3 (2)	42.8 (6)
Yes	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (4)
No	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	28.6 (4)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 92.0.0 Do you ever request that someone in family be quiet while studying?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	21.4 (3)
Yes	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	35.7 (5)

Table 6. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	33.3 (1)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	42.9 (6)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 93.1.0 Does anyone in family ask about your homework?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
Yes	100.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	71.4 (10)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	7.2 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 93.2.0 Who asks about your homework?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (3)	35.7 (5)
Mother	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	42.9 (6)
Both mother and father	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 95.0.0 Do you usually compare your report card grades with someone else's?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Yes	100.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	64.3 (9)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	21.4 (3)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 96.0.0 Does anyone usually ask about your report card grades?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Yes	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	100.0 (6)	71.4 (10)
No	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)

Table 6. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 96.2.0 Who usually asks about your report card?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	21.4 (3)
Parents	66.7 (2)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	35.7 (5)
Parents and siblings	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	14.3 (2)
Parents and friends	33.3 (1)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	28.6 (4)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 97.0.0 Which of the following persons is most admired?				
Person who works hard and gets good grades.	33.3 (1)	60.0 (3)	100.0 (6)	71.5 (10)
Person who gets good grades but doesn't work hard.	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Person who gets average grades but doesn't work hard.	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 98.1.0 Importance of grades.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Very important	66.7 (2)	80.0 (4)	100.0 (6)	85.8 (12)
Somewhat important	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 99.1.0 Definition of good grades:				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	21.4 (3)
A's	100.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)
A's, B's, and C's	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	42.9 (6)
A's and B's	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	7.1 (1)
Totals	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)

Table 6. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 99.2.0 Definition of bad grades:				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (2)	21.4 (3)
F's	66.7 (2)	80.0 (4)	66.7 (4)	71.4 (10)
D's	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.3 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
Q. 100.0.0 Do you work hard for your grades?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	14.3 (2)
Yes	100.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	83.3 (5)	78.6 (11)
No	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(6)	(14)
1968 MAT SCORES: GROUP MEANS				
Average Language Scores	7.1 (9)	6.4 (7)	4.7 (7)	
Average Reading Scores	6.9 (9)	5.5 (7)	3.3 (7)	
Average Math Scores	7.2 (9)	5.7 (7)	6.1 (7)	

Table 7. THE PROCESS OF MIGRATION AND VIEWS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 1.0.0 Parental respondents to migration interview.				
Father	50.0 (5)	50.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	46.2 (12)
Mother	50.0 (5)	50.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	46.2 (12)
Adopting father	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	3.8 (1)
Aunt	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	3.8 (1)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 5.0.0 Age of parental respondents to migration interview.				
25-35	10.0 (1)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	16.7 (4)
36-45	40.0 (4)	71.4 (5)	71.4 (5)	58.3 (14)
46-65	50.0 (5)	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (6)
Total	(10)	(7)	(7)	(24)
Q. 7.0.0 Type of location from which parental respondents originated.				
Metropolitan	50.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
Town	0.0 (0)	75.0 (6)	37.5 (3)	34.6 (9)
Rural	50.0 (5)	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	38.5 (10)
City	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	7.7 (2)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 9.0.0 Years of residence in Puerto Rico or place of origin prior to emigration.				
N.A., D.K.	50.0 (6)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (8)
13-17 years	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
18-24 years	10.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	26.9 (7)
23-25 years	10.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	19.2 (5)
36-45 years	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	11.5 (3)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 10.1.0 Pattern of migration to Chicago.				
D.K., D.N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
Direct to Chicago	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	75.0 (6)	42.3 (11)
P.R. to N.Y. to Chicago	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
P.R. to X to P.R. to Chicago	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	7.7 (2)
Others	60.0 (6)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (8)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 12.0.0 Reasons for leaving Puerto Rico or other place of origin; by number of mentions.				
Sought better environment	0.0 (0)	8.3 (1)	38.5 (5)	17.6 (6)
Employment and income	44.4 (4)	58.3 (7)	38.5 (5)	47.1 (16)
Join relatives, family	0.0 (0)	16.7 (2)	15.4 (2)	11.8 (4)
Political, religious reasons	55.6 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.7 (5)
Poor conditions in Puerto Rico	0.0 (0)	8.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	2.9 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	8.3 (1)	7.7 (1)	5.9 (2)
Total	(9)	(12)	(13)	(34)
Q. 14.0.0 How long between decision to come and arrival in Chicago?				
N.A., D.N.A.	40.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
A few days to a month	50.0 (5)	75.0 (6)	62.5 (5)	61.5 (16)
A month to a year	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	15.4 (4)
Several years	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.9 (1)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 15.0.0 Intended length of residence in Chicago.				
D.K., D.N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Indefinite	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	62.5 (5)	30.7 (8)
Up to one year	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	15.7 (4)
A year or more	10.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	19.2 (5)
Permanently	50.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 16.0.0 Intentions of returning to Puerto Rico.				
N.A., D.N.A.	100.0 (10)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	42.3 (11)
Uncertain	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	7.7 (2)
Yes	0.0 (0)	87.5 (7)	75.0 (6)	50.0 (13)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 16.1.0 When return is planned.				
N.A.	100.0 (10)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (10)
Periodic visits	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	7.7 (2)
No definite date	0.0 (0)	100.0 (8)	75.0 (6)	53.8 (14)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 16.2.0 Reasons for planned return.				
N.A., D.N.A.	100.0 (10)	12.5 (1)	25.0 (2)	50.0 (13)
For a visit	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	7.7 (2)
When have money/possessions	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	25.0 (2)	19.2 (5)
When possible	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	25.0 (2)	19.2 (5)
Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 18.0.0 Expectations of life in the U.S.				
N.A.	40.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
Better politically	30.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
Better economically	10.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	26.9 (7)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Fuerto Rican	Total
	"Better"	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	23.2 (6)
	No ideas	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	15.4 (4)
	Worse	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 19.0.0	Consideration of other places to go.				
	N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
	Yes	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	37.5 (3)	15.4 (4)
	No	60.0 (6)	87.5 (7)	62.5 (5)	69.2 (18)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 20.0	Received financial help for coming to Chicago.				
	N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
	Yes	40.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	62.5 (5)	46.2 (12)
	No	20.0 (2)	62.5 (5)	37.5 (3)	38.5 (10)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 20.1.0a	Source of financial help.				
	Had no help	60.0 (6)	62.5 (5)	37.5 (3)	53.8 (14)
	Family, friends	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	50.0 (4)	23.1 (6)
	P.R. Immigration	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
	Private ethnic agency	30.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
	State agency	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	3.8 (1)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 20.1.0b	Form of financial help.				
	N.A.	80.0 (8)	62.5 (5)	37.5 (3)	61.5 (16)
	Transportation	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	23.1 (6)
	Food and/or clothing	20.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	14.4 (4)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

256

Table 7. Cont.

		Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q.	21.0.0	Source of information about Chicago.				
		N.A.	40.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
		Family	20.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	30.8 (8)
		Friends	20.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	62.5 (5)	38.5 (10)
		Other	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	21.1.0	Favorable information about Chicago.				
		D.N.A., N.A.	40.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	19.2 (5)
		Money	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	23.1 (6)
		Work	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	23.1 (6)
		None	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
		Other	10.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	19.2 (5)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	21.2.0	Unfavorable information about Chicago.				
		N.A.	60.0 (6)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	26.9 (7)
		Weather	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	11.5 (3)
		Crime, delinquency, degeneracy	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	75.0 (6)	34.6 (9)
		None	20.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	23.1 (6)
		Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	25.0.0a	How does your neighborhood compare with others in Chicago?				
		D.N.A., N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
		Cannot judge	20.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	15.4 (4)
		Better than others	30.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	62.5 (5)	34.6 (9)
		Worse than others	40.0 (4)	75.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (10)
		As good as others	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	7.7 (2)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

Table 7. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 25.0.0b	Reasons this neighborhood is worse than others.				
	D.N.A., N.A.	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
	Ethnic differences	30.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	15.4 (4)
	Crime, lack of safety	10.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	19.2 (5)
	Dirt, squalor	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
	Noise, overcrowding, kids	20.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	75.0 (6)	38.5 (10)
	Other	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 25.1.0	How does this neighborhood compare with your place of origin?				
	D.N.A., N.A.	30.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	19.2 (5)
	Neutral	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	15.4 (4)
	Better	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	25.0 (2)	19.2 (5)
	Worse	50.0 (5)	37.5 (3)	50.0 (4)	46.2 (12)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 26.0.0	Who came with you?				
	D.N.A., N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
	Spouse and children	40.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	42.3 (11)
	Other relatives	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	11.5 (3)
	Friends	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
	No one	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	30.8 (8)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 28.0.0	When you moved, who did you know in Chicago?				
	N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
	Siblings and relatives	20.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)	30.8 (8)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Friends	10.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	50.0 (4)	30.8 (8)
No one	30.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	23.1 (6)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 29.0.0. Did anyone help you get settled in Chicago?				
D.N.A., N.A.	20.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
Yes	50.0 (5)	62.5 (5)	87.5 (7)	65.4 (17)
No	30.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	26.9 (7)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 29.1.0 Who helped you get settled in Chicago?				
D.N.A., N.A.	50.0 (5)	37.5 (3)	12.5 (1)	34.6 (9)
Relatives and friends	11.5 (3)	19.2 (5)	87.5 (7)	57.7 (15)
Agency	20.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 30.0.0a Since your arrival, have any relatives or friends moved to Chicago?				
D.N.A., N.A.	40.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
Yes	30.0 (3)	87.5 (7)	75.0 (6)	61.5 (16)
No	30.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	25.0 (2)	23.1 (6)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 30.0.0b Who has moved to Chicago since your arrival?				
D.N.A., N.A.	70.0 (7)	12.5 (1)	25.0 (2)	38.5 (10)
Relative	0.0 (0)	75.0 (6)	37.5 (3)	34.6 (9)
Friend	20.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	37.5 (3)	23.1 (6)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions			Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
		Other	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	30.0.0c	How many relatives or friends have moved here since your arrival?				
		D.N.A., N.A.	70.0 (7)	14.3 (1)	37.5 (3)	44.0 (11)
		1 or 2	0.0 (0)	42.9 (3)	0.0 (0)	12.0 (3)
		3 to 10	20.0 (2)	42.9 (3)	62.5 (5)	40.0 (10)
		10 or more	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)
		Total	(10)	(7)	(8)	(25)
Q.	33.1.0	How did you make friends in this neighborhood: chance meeting?				
		N.A.	20.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (4)
		Yes	70.0 (7)	50.0 (4)	100.0 (8)	73.1 (19)
		No	10.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	33.2.0	How did you make friends in this neighborhood: through relatives?				
		N.A.	90.0 (9)	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	53.8 (14)
		Yes	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	37.5 (3)	19.2 (5)
		No	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	25.0 (2)	26.9 (7)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q.	33.3.0	How did you make friends in this neighborhood: neighbors?				
		N.A.	10.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	15.4 (4)
		Yes	80.0 (8)	50.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	57.7 (15)
		No	10.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	26.9 (7)
		Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

Table 7. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 33.4.0 How did you make friends in this neighborhood: in your building?				
N.A.	40.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	30.8 (8)
Yes	30.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	50.0 (4)	38.5 (10)
No	30.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	25.0 (2)	30.8 (8)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 33.5.0 How did you make friends in this neighborhood: through church?				
N.A.	40.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	34.6 (9)
Yes	20.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	34.6 (9)
No	40.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	30.8 (8)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 33.6.0 How did you make friends in this neighborhood: through children?				
N.A.	20.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	26.9 (7)
Yes	60.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	30.8 (8)
No	20.0 (2)	75.0 (6)	37.5 (3)	42.3 (11)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 33.7.0 Does it take long to make friends in this neighborhood?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
Yes	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	50.0 (4)	19.2 (5)
No	100.0 (10)	50.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	69.2 (18)
Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

Table 7. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 34.0.0	Have you ever tried to solve some big problem by moving to another Chicago neighborhood?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)
	Yes	44.4 (4)	12.5 (1)	50.0 (4)	36.0 (9)
	No	55.6 (5)	75.0 (6)	50.0 (4)	60.0 (15)
	Total	(9)	(8)	(8)	(25)
Q. 35.0.0	Have you ever tried to solve children's problems by moving to another Chicago neighborhood?				
	N.A.	10.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (2)
	Yes	20.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	11.5 (3)
	No	70.0 (7)	87.5 (7)	87.5 (7)	80.8 (21)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)
Q. 36.0.0	Have you ever had problems with neighbors or children in this neighborhood?				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.8 (1)
	Yes	30.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (3)
	No	70.0 (7)	87.5 (7)	100.0 (8)	84.6 (22)
	Total	(10)	(8)	(8)	(26)

Table 8. PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 16.0.0a Current annual salary.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
$ 2,000- 2,999	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
3,000- 3,999	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
4,000- 4,999	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
5,000- 5,999	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (6)
6,000- 6,999	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
11,000-11,999	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 16.0.0b Estimated current household income.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	54.5 (6)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (7)
$ 3,000- 3,999	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)
4,000- 4,999	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)
5,000- 5,999	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	14.2 (3)
6,000- 6,999	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	9.5 (2)
7,000- 7,999	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)
8,000- 8,999	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	9.5 (2)
9,000- 9,999	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
10,000-10,999	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)
13,000-13,999	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)
14,000-over	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	9.5 (2)
Total	(5)	(11)	(5)	(21)
Q. 16.0.0c Type of current employment of parental respondents.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Clerical, sales	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Craftsmen, foremen	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Operators	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (6)
Non-household service worker	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Housewife only	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)

Table 8. Cont.

		Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
		Laborer (unskilled)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.5 (1)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q.	16.1.0	Length of time in current job.				
		N.A.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	17.6 (3)
		1 year or less	50.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	35.3 (6)
		1-2 years	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	11.8 (2)
		3-10 years	50.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	23.5 (4)
		10-20 years	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
		Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q.	16.4.0	What would you change about your job.				
		N.A.	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
		Uncertain	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
		No changes	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
		Better pay	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	11.1 (2)
		Better conditions	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
		Unionize	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q.	17.0.0	View of own job in comparison to jobs held by other people.				
		N.A.	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
		Same	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
		Just different	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
		Worse	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
		Better	20.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	60.0 (3)	38.9 (7)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 18.0.0 Ethnicity of co-workers.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
All kinds	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	44.4 (8)
Mostly Puerto Ricans	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Mostly Hispanos	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Mostly Northeast Europeans	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Mostly native Americans	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 20.0.0 Ethnicity of supervisor.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
All kinds	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Mostly Northeast Europeans	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	60.0 (3)	22.2 (4)
Mostly native Americans	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 21.2.0 How supervisor communicates satisfaction.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
It's never happened	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.5 (1)
Tells me I do good work	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	27.8 (5)
Shows by manner or gestures	60.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	38.9 (7)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 22.[illegible] How supervisor communicates dissatisfaction.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
It's never happened	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
Tells me about it.	80.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Shows by manner or behavior	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	38.9 (7)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 27.0.0	Expectation of promotion in present job.				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
	Yes	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (6)
	No	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (9)
	Uncertain	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 27.1.0	Chance of promotion in present job.				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
	No chance	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
	Uncertain	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
	Little chance	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
	Definite chance	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.5 (1)
	Likely	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
	Certain	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 27.2.0	Requirements for promotion.				
	N.A.	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
	No requirements	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
	Work harder	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
	Speak English	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	22.2 (4)
	Aquire more skills	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (5)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 28.0.0	Desire to change jobs.				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)
	Yes	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)
	No	75.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	56.2 (9)
	No, definitely not	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.2 (1)
	Total	(4)	(8)	(4)	(16)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 28.1.0 Type of job desired.				
N.A.	100.0 (4)	75.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	76.5 (13)
Craftsman, foreman	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	40.0 (2)	17.6 (3)
Operator	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 28.2.0 Chances of getting job desired.				
D.K.	100.0 (4)	62.5 (5)	60.0 (3)	70.6 (12)
None	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	40.0 (2)	17.6 (3)
Pretty good	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 29.0.0 Does English-speaking ability affect your work.				
N.A., D.K.	50.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	23.5 (4)
Yes	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	23.5 (4)
No	25.0 (1)	75.0 (6)	40.0 (2)	53.0 (9)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 29.2.0 Type of effect English- speaking ability has on work.				
N.A., D.K.	75.0 (3)	100.0 (7)	25.0 (1)	73.3 (11)
Getting instructions from boss	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Prevents promotion or getting new job	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	13.3 (2)
Prevents discussion of job problems	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	6.7 (1)
Total	(4)	(7)	(4)	(15)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 30.0.0 Respected by others for your job.				
N.A., D.K	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	27.8 (5)
Yes	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	80.0 (4)	55.5 (10)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Uncertain	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 31.0.0 Jobs commanding high respect.				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	50.0 (2)	35.2 (6)
Professional, technican	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	11.8 (2)
Managers, officials	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	17.6 (3)
Clerical, sales	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Craftsmen, foremen	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Operators	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Non-household service workers	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(4)	(17)
Q. 31.2.0 Jobs commanding low respect.				
N.A., D.K.	25.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	41.2 (7)
Clerical, sales	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Operators	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Non-household service workers	25.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	23.5 (4)
Unskilled laborers	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	23.5 (4)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 32.0.0 Jobs available to one's own kind.				
N.A., D.K	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Clerical, sales	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Craftsmen, foremen	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Operators	60.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	80.0 (4)	55.5 (10)
Private household workers	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 33.0.0 Jobs not available to one's own kind.				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	62.5 (5)	80.0 (4)	61.1 (11)
Professional, technical	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Managerial	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Clerical	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 34.2.0 Feelings toward unemployed Chicagoans who cannot find jobs.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	33.3 (6)
They cannot work	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
They are lazy	80.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (9)
Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 35.1.0 Feelings toward unemployed in Puerto Rico who cannot find jobs.				
N.A., D.K	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	52.9 (9)
They are lazy	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	29.4 (5)
They cannot work	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	17.7 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(4)	(17)
Q. 36.0.0 Importance of work.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (3)
Very important	60.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (9)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Important	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (6)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 36.1.0 Importance of work for a man.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (3)
Very important	80.0 (4)	62.5 (5)	80.0 (4)	72.2 (13)
Important	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 36.2.0 Importance of work for a woman.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Important	20.1 (1)	62.5 (5)	20.0 (1)	38.9 (7)
Not important	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	60.0 (3)	27.8 (5)
Other	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 38.1.0 Effect of job on respect for woman.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
More	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
No difference	60.0 (3)	50.0 (4)	20.0 (1)	44.4 (8)
Less	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Other	[illegible] (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 38.2.0 Feelings of husbands toward wives' working.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
They like it	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (6)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
They do not like it	60.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	60.0 (3)	50.0 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 39.0.0 Should children work.				
Yes	100.0 (5)	62.5 (5)	60.0 (3)	72.2 (13)
No	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	27.8 (5)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 40.0.0 Is education important to job child gets.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Yes	100.0 (5)	100.0 (8)	80.0 (4)	94.4 (17)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 44.0.0 Is college important in getting a job.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.9 (1)
Yes	50.0 (2)	100.0 (8)	80.0 (4)	82.3 (14)
Uncertain	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 44.1.0 Is college important for a boy's getting ~~a job~~.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Yes	60.0 (3)	100.0 (8)	80.0 (4)	83.3 (15)
Uncertain	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 44.2.0 Is college important for a girl's getting a job.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.5 (1)
Yes	40.0 (2)	100.0 (8)	80.0 (4)	77.8 (14)
Uncertain	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 45.0.0 Schools' need to improve program and preparation for jobs.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.8 (2)
Yes	75.0 (3)	75.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	70.5 (12)
No	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	11.8 (2)
Uncertain	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 45.0.0 What schools can do to prepare students for jobs.				
Don't know/uncertain	25.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	29.6 (5)
Better vocational counseling	25.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	17.6 (3)
Teach office skills	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	17.6 (3)
Provide work-study programs	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (2)	17.6 (3)
Other	25.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	17.6 (3)
Total	(4)	(8)	(5)	(17)
Q. 48.0.0 Estimate of job-level aspirations.				
Doesn't apply	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
No change	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	22.3 (4)
Up 1	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Up 2	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.3 (2)

Table 8. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Up 3	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Up 4	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.5 (1)
Up 5	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.5 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 48.3.0 Estimate of overall job aspiration.				
Does not apply	60.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	44.4 (8)
Low aspiration	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Moderate aspiration	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
High aspiration	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 49.0.0 Need for training.				
D.K.	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	100.0 (5)	55.5 (10)
Yes	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
No	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Uncertain	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 51.0.0 Adult women in the household working on the outside.				
Yes	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	80.0 (4)	44.4 (8)
No	40.0 (2)	87.5 (7)	20.0 (1)	55.6 (10)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 9. PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 9.0.0a Learning how to get along with others.				
Should be taught at school	80.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (5)
Should be taught at home	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	15.0 (3)
Should be taught at school and home	0.0 (0)	67.5 (7)	71.4 (5)	60.0 (12)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 9.0.0b How to teach social skills.				
N.A.	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)
Parents and teacher should model	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.0 (2)
Discipline and correction of behavior	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (3)	15.0 (3)
Cooperative projects and special programs	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
Giving advice	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	20.0 (4)
Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 11.0.0a Learning how to get along with adults.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Should be taught at school	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Should be taught mainly at home	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	42.9 (3)	40.0 (8)
Should be taught at both school and home.	20.0 (1)	62.5 (5)	42.9 (3)	45.0 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 11.0.0b How should schools go about teaching children to get along with adults?				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	42.9 (3)	35.0 (7)
By strict discipline	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
By modeling	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	15.0 (3)
Through discussions, counseling, and advice	20.0 (1)	75.0 (6)	28.6 (2)	45.0 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 11.0.0c How important is the school in teaching students to get along?				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Home more important	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	42.9 (3)	40.0 (8)
Takes both home and school	20.0 (1)	62.5 (5)	57.1 (4)	50.0 (10)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 13.0.0a How do schools prepare a student for a job?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	42.9 (3)	30.0 (6)
Insisting they finish high school	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	15.0 (3)
For professional jobs, by preparing him for college	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	20.0 (4)
Preparation for office job	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	20.0 (4)
Help them find work	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 13.0.0b What kind of work do/should schools prepare students for? (U.S. Census categories)				
N.A., D.K.	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	25.0 (5)
Professional, technical	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Clerical, sales	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	42.9 (3)	35.0 (7)
Craftsmen, foremen	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Operators	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
For college entrance	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 13.0.0c Specific work mentioned in 13.0.0b (number of mentions)				
No work mentioned	20.0 (1)	22.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (3)
Office work	20.0 (1)	44.4 (4)	42.9 (3)	38.1 (8)
Professional	0.0 (0)	22.2 (2)	28.6 (2)	19.0 (4)
Carpentry, electrical, mechanical	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	4.8 (1)
Depends on ability and amount of education	60.0 (3)	11.1 (1)	14.3 (1)	23.8 (5)
Total	(5)	(9)	(7)	(21)
Q. 18.0.0a Assessment of parent-teacher relations.				
Good	60.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	28.6 (2)	50.0 (10)
Acceptable	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	57.1 (4)	40.0 (8)
Bad	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 18.0.0b Do parents visit at school?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Yes	80.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	100.0 (7)	75.0 (15)
No or uncertain	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 18.0.0c Why do/should parents visit at school? (number of mentions)				
Letter sent or called by teacher	44.4 (4)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	27.6 (8)
Special programs or meetings	55.6 (5)	33.3 (4)	25.0 (2)	37.9 (11)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
To check child's progress and conduct	0.0 (0)	66.7 (8)	25.0 (2)	34.5 (10)
Total	(9)	(12)	(8)	(29)
Q. 19.0.0a How does teacher inform parents about child's progress?				
Report card	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)
Papers and children's work	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
Notes or letters	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	57.1 (4)	40.0 (8)
Report cards and special programs	80.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	25.0 (5)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 19.0.0b How should teachers communicate to parents about their children?				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	20.0 (4)
Report card	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Notes or letters	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	28.6 (2)	25.0 (5)
Open house, P.T.A., special programs	60.0 (3)	50.0 (4)	14.3 (1)	40.0 (8)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 19.0.0c Actual feelings during parent-teacher interactions.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Good	60.0 (3)	75.0 (6)	71.4 (5)	70.0 (14)
Bad	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	20.0 (4)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 19.0.0d How should teachers make parents feel during interactions?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 19.0.0d Cont.				
Good	100.0 (5)	75.0 (6)	85.7 (6)	85.0 (17)
Familiar with one another	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 20.0.0a Does child's behavior differ at school and in the home?				
Yes	80.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	42.9 (3)	55.0 (11)
No	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	57.1 (4)	45.0 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 20.0.0b Is child more obedient at school or in the home?				
More obedient at school	60.0 (3)	50.0 (4)	57.1 (4)	55.0 (11)
No difference	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	42.9 (3)	45.0 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 20.0.0c Is child more respectful at school or in the home?				
More respectful in school	60.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	57.1 (4)	60.0 (12)
No difference	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	42.9 (3)	40.0 (8)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 20.0.0d What differences in obedience and respect are there for boys and girls?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
No differences	40.0 (2)	75.0 (6)	85.7 (6)	70.0 (14)
Girls are more obedient and respectful	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	25.0 (5)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 22.0.0a Preferred disciplinary agent for boys for school misbehavior.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	15.8 (3)
Teacher	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	50.0 (3)	47.4 (9)
Principal	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
Parent	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	16.7 (1)	21.1 (4)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 22.0.0b Actual disciplinary agent for boys.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	26.3 (5)
Teacher	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	31.6 (6)
Principal	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	16.7 (1)	15.8 (3)
Both teacher and principal	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.2 (1)
Parent, teacher, and principal	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.2 (1)
No one	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 22.0.0c Preferred form of discipline for boys.				
N.A., D.K.	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	80.0 (4)	50.0 (9)
Talk to them	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Corporal punishment	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Tell or threaten to tell parent	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Keep after school	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 22.0.0d Actual form of discipline for boys.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	62.5 (5)	20.0 (1)	38.9 (7)
Corporal punishment	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	60.0 (3)	27.8 (5)
Talking to them	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Take away privileges	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Threaten to tell parents or suspension	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 22.0.0e Preferred disciplinary agent for girls for school misbehavior.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	15.8 (3)
Teacher	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	50.0 (3)	47.4 (9)
Principal	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
Parent	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.3 (1)
Teacher, principal, and parent	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 22.0.0d Actual disciplinary agent for girls.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	26.3 (5)
Teacher	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	33.3 (2)	31.6 (6)
Principal	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	21.1 (4)
Teacher and principal	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
No one	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 22.0.0g Preferred form of discipline for girls.				
N.A., D.K.	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	80.0 (4)	50.0 (9)
Talk to them	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Corporal punishment	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Threaten to tell parent	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Keep after school	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 22.0.0h Actual form of discipline for girls.				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	62.5 (5)	20.0 (1)	44.4 (8)
Corporal punishment	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	16.7 (3)
Talking to them	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Take away privileges	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Threaten to tell parent or suspension	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 23.0.0 When should teacher reward a child?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	10.5 (2)
During performance	0.0 (0)	100.0 (8)	16.7 (1)	47.4 (9)
After he accomplishes task	100.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	42.1 (8)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 24.0.0 When should parents visit the school concerning child's misbehavior?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	80.0 (4)	22.2 (4)
Immediately after notification	100.0 (5)	87.5 (7)	20.0 (1)	72.2(13)
When they can go without losing pay	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 26.0.0a At school, who does the parent talk to concerning child's misbehavior?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	22.2 (4)
Principal	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	60.0 (3)	44.4 (8)
Teacher	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Principal and teacher	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Adjustment office people	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	16.7 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 26.0.0b Who should the parent talk to concerning child's misbehavior?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
Principal	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	22.2 (4)
Teacher	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	27.8 (5)
Child, principal, and teacher	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
Teacher and child	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 26.0.0c Is the child present during these discussions?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (3)
Yes	100.0 (5)	87.5 (7)	60.0 (3)	83.3 (15)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 26.0.0d Should the child be present for these discussions?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	10.5 (2)
Yes	100.0 (5)	75.0 (6)	50.0 (3)	73.7 (14)
No	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	16.7 (1)	15.8 (3)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 26.0.0e How should the parent treat the child while still at school?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	5.9 (1)
Counsel him	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.8 (2)
Scold and punish him	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	25.0 (1)	29.4 (5)
Counsel; then punish at home later on	80.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	50.0 (2)	52.9 (9)
Total	(5)	(8)	(4)	(17)

Table 9. Cont.

		Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q.	26.0.0f	Once home, how should the child be treated?				
		N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	40.0 (2)	16.7 (3)
		Counsel	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
		Punish	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	40.0 (2)	38.9 (7)
		Punish and counsel	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
		Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	5.6 (1)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q.	26.0.0g	Does/should this treatment differ for boys and for girls?				
		N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
		No	80.0 (4)	87.5 (7)	80.0 (4)	83.3 (15)
		Yes	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q.	27.0.0a	Importance of regular school attendance.				
		N.A.	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
		Very important	100.0 (5)	62.5 (5)	42.9 (3)	65.0 (13)
		Important	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	42.9 (3)	25.0 (5)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q.	27.0.0b	Why is education important?				
		N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	100.0 (6)	42.1 (8)
		For later life (jobs)	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
		To get a good education	40.0 (2)	62.5 (5)	0.0 (0)	36.8 (7)
		Boys need more education	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
		Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 28.0.0 Do parents affect the school in any way?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	15.0 (3)
Yes	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	25.0 (5)
Alone no, united yes	40.0 (2)	75.0 (6)	57.1 (4)	60.0 (12)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 30.0.0a Does schooling prepare students for jobs?				
N.A.	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	85.7 (6)	50.0 (10)
Yes	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	25.0 (5)
Uncertain	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (5)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 30.0.0b Describe a child's formal education in Chicago.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	28.6 (2)	25.0 (5)
Don't know much about it	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	28.6 (2)	30.0 (6)
(Parent knows all subjects child takes)	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	42.9 (3)	40.0 (8)
Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 30.0.0c Educational differences for boys and girls.				
N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	85.7 (6)	45.0 (9)
Same for both	40.0 (2)	75.0 (6)	14.3 (1)	45.0 (9)
Different	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)

Tale 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 34.0.0a Reasons a boy or girl leaves school.				
Alienation: dislike, boredom	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	60.0 (3)	44.4 (8)
Lacks intelligence	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
To earn money	80.0 (4)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (1)	38.9 (7)
Sickness	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	20.0 (1)	11.1 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(5)	(18)
Q. 34.0.0b Attitude toward dropping out.				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	10.5 (2)
Negative	80.0 (4)	100.0 (8)	66.7 (4)	84.2 (16)
Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 34.0.0c Is attitude toward dropping out the same for both boys and girls?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.0 (2)
Same	20.0 (1)	100.0 (8)	71.4 (5)	70.0 (14)
Different, unspecified	80.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 35.0.0a Describe differences between a school attender and a dropout.				
D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Great difference, unspecified	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	50.0 (3)	31.6 (6)
Great difference: better job for school attender	60.0 (3)	62.5 (5)	50.0 (3)	57.9 (11)
Depends on person	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 35.0.0b Jobs attained by school finishers and dropouts.				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	15.8 (3)

Table 9. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Dropout hasn't much chance in life	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	10.5 (2)
	Dropout gets worst jobs	40.0 (2)	87.5 (7)	33.3 (2)	57.9 (11)
	Job doesn't depend on years of education, but on practicing what is learned	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	16.7 (1)	15.8 (3)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 39.0.0a	Feelings toward family of a high school graduate.				
	N.A.	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
	Family feels pride	0.0 (0)	87.5 (7)	100.0 (6)	68.4 (13)
	Makes no difference	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	No one's business	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 39.0.0b	Feelings toward family of a high school dropout.				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	100.0 (6)	42.1 (8)
	Broken-hearted	20.0 (1)	87.5 (7)	0.0 (0)	42.1 (8)
	Makes no difference	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (2)
	Other	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)
Q. 39.0.0c	Are feelings different for son or daughter who drops out?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	100.0 (6)	42.1 (8)
	Same for son or daughter	20.0 (1)	87.5 (7)	0.0 (0)	42.1 (8)
	Different for son and daughter	60.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.8 (3)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(6)	(19)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 44.0.0	Relative importance of behavior and grades.				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
	Behavior more important	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
	Grades more important	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
	Both equally important	80.0 (4)	50.0 (4)	71.4 (5)	65.0 (13)
	Other	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 45.0.0a	Why parents communicate education-job connection to children.				
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	10.0 (2)
	Don't talk about future	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	20.0 (4)
	Emphasize job of tomorrow depends on today's education	80.0 (4)	87.5 (7)	28.6 (2)	65.0 (13)
	Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 45.0.0b	Knowledge of child's occupational plans.				
	N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	42.9 (3)	25.0 (5)
	Doesn't know	40.0 (2)	25.0 (2)	28.6 (2)	30.0 (6)
	Knows what child wants to do	40.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)
	Knows child's wants and has planned how to help child	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	15.0 (3)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 45.0.0c	Is education essential to get jobs?				
	N.A., D.K.	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	42.9 (3)	30.0 (6)
	Can get jobs without education	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)

Table 9. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Can't get jobs without education	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	42.9 (3)	35.0 (7)
	Only if education and experience are combined	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 45.0.0d	Do you hope your child will get a better job than yours?				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
	Yes	80.0 (4)	100.0 (8)	85.7 (6)	90.0 (18)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 46.0.0	Jobs available to kids with eighth grade education.				
	N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
	Poor jobs	40.0 (2)	67.5 (5)	42.9 (3)	50.0 (10)
	Laborer	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	57.1 (4)	25.0 (5)
	Factory work	20.0 (1)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (4)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 46.0.0b	Compare the jobs a Puerto Rican and North American girl can get with an eighth grade education.				
	N.A., D.K.	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	25.0 (5)
	Same as N.A. girl	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	28.6 (2)	35.0 (7)
	Different because P.R. girl marries and keeps house; N.A. girl knows English, marries, and works	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	57.1 (4)	30.0 (6)
	Other	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 47.0.0a Describe requisite education for a medical doctor.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	85.7 (6)	55.0 (11)
Finish high school	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
4-years college	40.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
College and post-college	60.0 (3)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0b Where to get M.D. education, by number of mentions.				
N.A., D.K.	100.0 (5)	33.3 (3)	14.3 (1)	42.9 (9)
Chicago	0.0 (0)	22.2 (2)	28.6 (2)	19.0 (4)
Puerto Rico	0.0 (0)	22.2 (2)	14.3 (1)	14.3 (3)
Spain	0.0 (0)	22.2 (2)	42.9 (3)	23.8 (5)
Total	(5)	(9)	(7)	(21)
Q. 47.0.0c Describe requisite education for a teacher.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	85.7 (6)	50.0 (10)
Some college	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
4-years college	100.0 (5)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	40.0 (8)
College and post-college	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0d Describe requisite education for a social worker.				
N.A., D.K.	60.0 (3)	75.0 (6)	85.7 (6)	75.0 (15)
Finish high school	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Some college	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
4-years college	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	College and post college	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0e	Describe requisite education for an engineer.				
	N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	62.5 (5)	85.7 (6)	60.0 (12)
	Some college	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
	4-years college	40.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	20.0 (4)
	College and post-college	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0f	Where is your child likely to find a professional job?				
	N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	28.6 (2)	20.0 (4)
	Chicago	80.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	57.1 (4)	45.0 (9)
	Chicago or Puerto Rico	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	15.0 (3)
	Any place	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	20.0 (4)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0g	Amount of education desired for child.				
	Some high school	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
	Finish high school	60.0 (3)	50.0 (4)	71.4 (5)	60.0 (12)
	Go to college	20.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	14.3 (1)	30.0 (6)
	Finish college	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)
	Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 47.0.0h	Type of job desired for child.				
	N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
	Professional, technical	20.0 (1)	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	20.0 (4)
	Managerial	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (1)	5.0 (1)

Table 9. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Clerical, sales	40.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	14.3 (1)	35.0 (7)
Craftsmen, foremen	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	42.9 (3)	25.0 (5)
Operators	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 48.0.0a Relative influence of family and school on child's job aspiration.				
Family foremost	0.0 (0)	50.0 (4)	71.4 (5)	45.0 (9)
School foremost	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Both school and family equally	80.0 (4)	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	40.0 (8)
Neither	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 48.0.0b Judgment of parents' attitude toward school.				
Highly positive	20.0 (1)	75.0 (6)	28.6 (2)	45.0 (9)
Positive	60.0 (3)	12.5 (1)	71.4 (5)	45.0 (9)
Neutral	20.0 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)
Q. 48.0.0c Parents' practice of confining student in the home.				
N.A.	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (1)
Strongly confines youth	0.0 (0)	75.0 (6)	42.9 (3)	45.0 (9)
Moderately confines youth	80.0 (4)	12.5 (1)	42.9 (3)	40.0 (8)
Tries to confine, but can't	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	14.3 (1)	10.0 (2)
Total	(5)	(8)	(7)	(20)

Table 10. FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPAL SAMPLE YOUTH: SOCIAL NETWORK AND SELF-ESTEEM

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 3.5a Academic track in high school of respondents, first semester.				
N.A., D.K.	70.0 (7)	44.4 (4)	50.0 (5)	55.2 (16)
Basic track	10.0 (1)	11.1 (1)	10.0 (1)	10.3 (3)
Essentials track	0.0 (0)	11.1 (1)	30.0 (3)	13.8 (4)
Regular track	20.0 (2)	33.3 (3)	10.0 (1)	20.7 (6)
Total	(10)	(9)	(10)	(29)
Q. 3.5b Academic track in high school of respondents, second semester.				
N.A., D.K.	70.0 (7)	50.0 (5)	70.0 (7)	63.3 (19)
Basic track	10.0 (1)	10.0 (1)	10.0 (1)	10.0 (3)
Essentials track	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)	20.0 (2)	10.0 (3)
Regular track	20.0 (2)	30.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (5)
Total	(10)	(10)	(10)	(30)
Q. 6.0 Is there something you'd like to learn that's not taught at school?				
Yes	33.3 (1)	20.0 (1)	100.0 (3)	45.5 (5)
No	66.7 (2)	80.0 (4)	0.0 (0)	54.5 (6)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 8.3 Religion of follow-up sample.				
None	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (1)
Catholic	66.7 (2)	80.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	81.1 (9)
Pentacostal	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 9.0 Do you trust your best friend?				
Yes	100.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.9 (10)

Table 10. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 10.0 Are there people you don't like?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	9.1 (1)
Yes	100.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	36.4 (4)
No	0.0 (0)	100.0 (5)	33.3 (1)	54.5 (6)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 11.01a Ethnicity of first friend mentioned.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Spanish surname	33.3 (1)	80.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	72.7 (8)
Non-Spanish surname	66.7 (2)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	27.3 (3)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 11.01b Ethnicity over three friendship choices.				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Spanish surname only	0.0 (0)	60.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	45.5 (5)
Non-Spanish surname only	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	9.0 (1)
Mixed ethnicity	66.7 (2)	40.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	45.5 (5)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 12.0 Do you like most Puerto Ricans?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	100.0 (5)	100.0 (3)	90.9 (10)
No	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (1)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
Q. 13.0 Do you have non-Puerto Rican friends?				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

Table 10. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Yes	100.0 (3)	80.0 (4)	66.7 (2)	81.8 (9)
No	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	18.2 (2)
Total	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)
SELF-ESTEEM SCORES AFTER FRESHMAN YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL				
General Self-esteem				
Average	21.33	18.80	13.33	18.00
Range	19-23	13-24	12-15	12-24
Social Self-peers				
Average	7.67	5.20	6.00	6.1
Range	7-8	3-8	5-7	3-8
Home and Parents				
Average	5.33	4.20	5.67	4.91
Range	4-6	2-8	2-8	2-8
School-Academic				
Average	5.67	4.60	4.00	4.71
Range	3-8	1-8	2-6	1-8
Total Self-esteem				
Average	40.00	32.20	29.00	33.45
Range	34-44	20-47	25-32	20-47
N=	(3)	(5)	(3)	(11)

Table 11. FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS WITH PRINCIPAL SAMPLE YOUTH: EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY AND CULTURE CODING OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 1.0.0a Do you enjoy school this year?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	66.7 (4)	66.7 (4)	66.7 (2)	66.7 (10)
No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 1.0.0b Is there anything you particularly like about school?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
Certain subjects	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	33.3 (5)
More freedom, responsibility	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
New friends	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 1.1.0 Is there anything you particularly dislike about school?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
Yes	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
No	66.7 (4)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 2.0.0 Opinion of this school as compared to other schools.				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Positive	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	46.7 (7)
Neutral	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
Negative	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 3.0.0 Are you like other students in your school?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	83.3 (5)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	60.0 (9)
No	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 4.0.0 Are there students in school who do not like Puerto Ricans?				
N.A., D.K.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
Yes	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
No	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 5.0.0 Does anyone in family ask about your homework?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	83.3 (5)	66.7 (4)	66.7 (2)	73.3 (11)
No	00.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 5.1.0 Who asks about your homework?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
Mother	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)
Mother and father	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (1)	13.3 (2)
Father	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 5.6.0 Does anyone usually ask about your report card grades?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	83.3 (5)	66.7 (4)	66.7 (2)	73.3 (11)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 5.6.1 Who usually asks about your report card?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Parents	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	33.3 (5)
Parents and siblings	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Parents and friends	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 8.1.0 Are teachers ever critical of you for being absent?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
No	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
Other	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 8.2.0 Does being absent affect your grades?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	66.7 (4)	66.7 (4)	33.3 (1)	60.0 (9)
No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 8.3.1 Why are you usually absent?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
Illness	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	46.7 (7)
Do not feel like going	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Work at home	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 9.0.0 Consequences of dropping out of school. (number of mentions)				
N.A.	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.5 (1)
Will not get a good job	37.5 (3)	60.0 (6)	75.0 (3)	54.5 (12)
Will not get a good education	25.0 (2)	30.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	27.3 (6)
Miserable life, will not earn enough	25.0 (2)	10.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.6 (3)
Will not keep a job	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(8)	(10)	(4)	(22)
Q. 9.1.0 Reasons boy or girl leaves school. (number of mentions)				
N.A.	11.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)
Alienation: boredom, does not like school	22.2 (2)	66.7 (6)	71.4 (5)	52.0 (13)
Trouble at school	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (5)
Money and jobs	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	28.6 (2)	24.0 (6)
Lack of intelligence	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(9)	(9)	(7)	(25)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 10.0.0 Do students behave differently at home and in school?				
N.A.	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	66.7 (2)	60.0 (9)
Yes	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 10.1.0 Are you more obedient at home or in school?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
At home	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)
At school	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
No difference	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 10.2.0 Are you more respectful at home or in school?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
At home	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
At school	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (3)
No difference	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 10.3.0 Are girls more obedient and respectful than boys?				
N.A.	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
No difference	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
Girls more obedient/respectful	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Boys more obedient/respectful	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 11.2.3 When should parent visit school concerning his child's wrongdoing?				
N.A.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
Immediately after notification	33.3 (2)	16.7 (1)	100.0 (3)	40.0 (6)
When they can go without losing pay	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Day after	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Should not come at all	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 11.3.5 Who does the parent talk to about [illegible] havior in the school? (number of mentions)				
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Principal	0.0 (0)	28.6 (2)	33.3 (1)	16.7 (3)
Teacher	25.0 (2)	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Principal and teacher	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	66.7 (2)	33.3 (6)
Office personnel	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Counselor	37.5 (3)	14.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Total	(8)	(7)	(3)	(18)
Q. 13.0.0 When should a teacher reward a student?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
While he is doing something	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
After he completes it	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	53.3 (8)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Both	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Depends on age	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.1.0 Are two boys who are friends inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (3)	86.7 (13)
No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.2.0 Are two girls who are friends inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	100.0 (6)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (12)
No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.3.0 Are a boy and girl inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	50.0 (3)	66.7 (4)	33.3 (1)	53.3 (8)
No	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.4.0 Are a male teacher and a male student inclined to kid around?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	100.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	73.3 (11)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	100.0 (3)	20.0 (3)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.5.0 Are a female teacher and female student inclined to kid around?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	83.3 (5)	33.3 (1)	73.3 (11)
No	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	66.7 (2)	20.0 (3)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.6.0 Are a male teacher and a female student inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)
No	16.7 (1)	83.3 (5)	100.0 (3)	60.0 (9)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.7.0 Are a female teacher and a male student inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	53.3 (8)
No	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	100.0 (3)	40.0 (6)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.8.0 Are a teacher and parent inclined to kid one another?				
N.A., D.K.	20.0 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)
Yes	0.0 (0)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)
No	80.0 (4)	33.3 (2)	100.0 (3)	64.3 (9)
Total	(5)	(6)	(3)	(14)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 15.9.0 Are father and son inclined to kid around?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	100.0 (6)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (12)
No	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.9.2 Are mother and son inclined to kid around?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	83.3 (5)	100.0 (6)	33.3 (1)	80.0 (12)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (2)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 15.9.4 Are father and daughter inclined to kid around?				
N.A., D.K.	33.3 (2)	66.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
Yes	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)
No	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 21.0.0 How do Chicago schools prepare a student for a job?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Vocational counseling	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Provide work-study programs	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Teach occupational skills in coursework	66.7 (4)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	46.7 (7)
Other	0.0 (0)	16.7 (1)	66.7 (2)	20.0 (3)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 22.0.0a Importance of work for a male.				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Very important	33.3 (2)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)
Important	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	100.0 (3)	60.0 (9)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 22.0.0b Importance of work for a female.				
N.A., D.K.	33.3 (2)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
Very important	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Important	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Not important	33.3 (2)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	46.7 (7)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 22.2.0a What good jobs are, categorized by U.S. Census occupational categories, by number of mentions.				
N.A., D.K.	8.3 (1)	18.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.7 (3)
Professional, technical	50.0 (6)	36.4 (4)	60.0 (3)	46.4(13)
Managers, officials, proprietors	0.0 (0)	18.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (2)
Clerical, sales, kindred workers	25.0 (3)	18.2 (2)	40.0 (2)	25.0 (7)
Craftsmen, foremen, etc.	16.7 (2)	9.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.7 (3)
Total	(12)	(11)	(5)	(28)
Q. 22.4.0 What help would you need in order to get one of these jobs?				
N.A., D.K.	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Financial help	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	6.7 (1)
Opportunity for further education	50.0 (3)	83.3 (5)	33.3 (1)	60.0 (9)
Learn more in school	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	6.7 (1)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Help finding job	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 22.4.1 Have you received help?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)
Yes	83.3 (4)	50.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	53.3 (8)
No	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	20.0 (5)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 22.4.2 Has the school helped you?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	26.7 (4)
Yes	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
No	33.3 (2)	50.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	46.7 (7)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 22.4.3 Would you like help now?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
Yes	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (6)
No	33.3 (2)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (6)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 24.0.0 Effect of a job on respect for a woman.				
N.A., D.K.	33.3 (2)	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)
More respect	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (5)
No difference	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (2)	26.7 (4)
Less respect	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	16.7 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (3)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. 24.1.0 Feelings of husbands toward wife's working.				
N.A., D.K.	66.7 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)
They like it	0.0 (0)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (3)
They do not like it	33.3 (2)	66.7 (4)	33.3 (1)	46.7 (7)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 25.0.0 Should students work?				
N.A., D.K.	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Yes	66.7 (4)	100.0 (6)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (12)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	6.7 (1)
Other	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)
Q. 26.1.2 Number of mentions of type of job one can get with eighth grade education, categorized by U.S. Census categories.				
N.A.	11.1 (1)	33.3 (2)	33.3 (1)	22.2 (4)
Clerical, sales	11.1 (1)	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	16.7 (3)
Operators	11.1 (1)	33.3 (2)	66.7 (2)	27.8 (5)
Non-household service work	44.4 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	22.2 (4)
Laborer (unskilled)	22.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	11.1 (2)
Total	(9)	(6)	(3)	(18)
Q. 27.0.0 Is education important to the kind of work a person will do?				
N.A.	16.7 (1)	50.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)

Table 11. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Yes	66.7 (4)	50.0 (3)	100.0 (3)	66.7 (10)
No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	16.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)
Total	(6)	(6)	(3)	(15)

Table 12. FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS WITH PRINCIPAL SAMPLE YOUTH: OCCUPATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. B1.1 Significant others: talked to regarding education beyond high school.				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.2 Significant others: talked to regarding work in school beyond high school.				
Yes	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
No	33.3 (1)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	80.0 (8)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.3 Significant others: talked to regarding social life in school after high school.				
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
No	100.0 (3)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (10)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.4 Significant others: do you know someone who has achieved success through education beyond high school?				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. B1.5 Significant others: do you know someone involved in work in school beyond high school?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
No	33.3 (1)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	80.0 (8)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.6 Significant others: do you know someone experienced in social life beyond high school?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
No	33.3 (1)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	80.0 (8)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.7 Estimated ability of family to help with college.				
Easily afford it	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Can afford it	100.0 (3)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (4)
Afford with sacrifice	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
Must support family	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (4)
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B1.8 Estimate of family income compared with others in neighborhood.				
Much above average	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Somewhat above average	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
Average	66.7 (2)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	50.0 (5)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Somewhat below average	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Considerably below average	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
N.A., D.K.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B2.1 Significant others: talked to regarding kind of work in different jobs.				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B2.2 Significant others: talked to about benefits of different jobs.				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B2.3 Significant others: do you know someone with jobs you've thought about?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
No	33.3 (1)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	80.0 (8)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B2.4 Significant others: do you know someone with benefits from a job you've thought about?				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.1 Significant others: talked to someone regarding right job for you.				
Yes	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
No	100.0 (3)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (10)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.2 Significant others: talked to someone regarding right working conditions for you.				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.3 Significant others: talked to someone regarding right benefits for you.				
Yes	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
No	66.7 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (3)	90.0 (9)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.4 Most liked job:				
Professional, technical, kindred workers	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions		Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (3)	50.0 (5)
	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred workers	66.7 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
	Operators and kindred workers	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.4.1	How long have you wanted the job mentioned in B3.4?				
	Less than 3 months	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
	About 6 months	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
	About 1 year	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
	About 2 years	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
	More than 2 years	33.3 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
	N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.5	Job you are most likely to get after schooling is over:				
	N.A., D.K., D.N.A.	33.3 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
	Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (4)
	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred workers	66.6 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
	Operators and kindred workers	0.0 (0)	33.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B3.6	Certainty about job mentioned in B3.5:				
	Very uncertain	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
	Uncertain	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
	Neither certain nor uncertain	0.0 (0)	75.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Certain	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
Very certain	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (2)	20.0 (2)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. B4.0 Expected age at marriage:				
17 or under	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
18 - 20	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
21 - 22	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
23 - 26	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
27 or older	66.6 (2)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C1.0 Importance of school this year:				
Very important	33.3 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
Somewhat important	66.7 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
Not very important	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Does not matter at all	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (0)	10.0 (1)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C1.5 Importance of grades this year:				
Very important	0.0 (0)	75.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
Somewhat important	100.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (4)
Not very important	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Does not matter at all	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
Q. C2.0 Do you usually compare report cards with someone?				
Yes	33.3 (1)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
No	66.7 (2)	25.0 (1)	66.7 (2)	50.0 (5)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C3.0 Feelings about amount of time you spend in school:				
Too much time	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Enough time	100.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	66.6 (2)	80.0 (8)
Not enough time	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C4.0 What kind of person is the most admired student?				
Makes good grades and works hard	66.7 (2)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	70.0 (7)
Makes good grades but does not work hard	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Makes average grades but never cracks a book	33.3 (1)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C5.0 Name the most popular students in your high school:				
Did name most popular H.S. student	66.7 (2)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
Doesn't know	33.3 (1)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (2)	50.0 (5)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C6.0 In your school, are there advantages to being Puerto Rican?				
Yes	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (2)	40.0 (4)
No	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
D.K., D.N.A.	66.7 (2)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	50.0 (5)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C6.5 Ethnic awareness: are there other nationalities besides Puerto Ricans in your school?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (2)	60.0 (6)
No	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
D.K.	0.0 (0)	50.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (2)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C8.0 Do your parents visit your school?				
Often	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
Seldom	0.0 (0)	75.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	40.0 (4)
Never	66.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C8.2 Which parent visits the school?				
Mother	66.7 (2)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	70.0 (7)
Father	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Both together	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

Table 12. Cont.

	Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
	Both, not together	33.3 (1)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C9.5	Would you like to study some of your subjects in Spanish?				
	Yes	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
	No	100.0 (3)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (1)	60.0 (6)
	D.K.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
	N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C9.9	Is English necessary to get along in Chicago?				
	Yes	100.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (8)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
	N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C9.9.1	Is English necessary to attend college?				
	Yes	100.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (8)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
	N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
	Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C9.9.2	Is English necessary for getting a good job?				
	Yes	100.0 (3)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (2)	80.0 (8)
	No	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

Table 12. Cont.

Questions	Non Puerto Rican	Chicago Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican	Total
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C9.9.3 Does the ability to speak English affect getting a job?				
Yes	66.7 (2)	75.0 (3)	33.3 (1)	60.0 (6)
No	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	33.3 (1)	20.0 (2)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)
Q. C10.3 Do you read a newspaper?				
Yes, English language	66.7 (2)	75.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (5)
Yes, Spanish language	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
Yes, English and Spanish	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
No	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (2)	30.0 (3)
N.A., D.N.A.	0.0 (0)	25.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (1)
Total	(3)	(4)	(3)	(10)

Table 13-1

Distribution of the Stratified Constant Sample of 30 Youths, Drawn in March 1968

	Non Puerto Rican		Chicago Puerto Rican		Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total
High Group*	3	2	2	2	1		10
Middle Group	2	1		3	1	2	9
Low Group		2	3		3	3	11
Total	5	5	5	5	5	5	30

---

*Groupings were based on reading scores in English.

Table 13-2

Distribution of the Stratified Constant Sample of 30 Youths in October 1968

Location of Sample	Non Puerto Rican		Chicago Puerto Rican		Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
In school in district X 8th grade classrooms							
High							
Room 315	4	2		2	1		9
Room 12				1			1
Room118			1	1	1		3
Medium							
Room 301				1			1
Room 117		1	1		2		4
Low							
Room 302		1	1		1	3	6
Retained in 7th grade	1	1					2
Transferred to special school						1	1
Subtotal	5	5	3	5	5	4	27
Moved to distant area of city contact contact lost			1				1
Returned to Puerto Rico						1	1
Dropped out			1				1
Subtotal	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
Total	5	5	5	5	5	5	30

Table 13-3

Distribution of the Stratified Constant Sample of 30 Youths, first drawn in March 1968, in June 1969

Location of Sample	Non Puerto Rican		Chicago Puerto Rican		Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
In school in district X 8th grade classrooms							
High							
Room 315	3	1		1			5
Room 12							
Room 118			1	1			2
Medium							
Room 301				1			1
Room 117		1			2		3
Low							
Room 302			1		1	3	5
Retained in 7th grade		1					1
Transferred to special school						1	1
Subtotal	3	3	2	3	3	4	18
Moved to distant area of city							
contact		1					1
contact lost			1				1
Returned to Puerto Rico					2	1	3
Dropped out							
contact			1				1
contact lost	1			1			2
Family refused	1	1	1	1			4
Subtotal	2	2	3	2	2	1	12
Total	5	5	5	5	5	5	30

Table 13-4

Distribution of the Stratified Constant
Sample of 30 Youths, Drawn in June 1970

Location of Sample	Non Puerto Rican		Chicago Puerto Rican		Puerto Rican/ Puerto Rican		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
In school in district X							
High school building			1	3	1	1	6
Branch	1		1				2
Other high school	2						2
Still in elementary		1					1
Subtotal	3	1	2	3	1	1	11
Moved to distant area of city							
contact							
contact lost		2	1	1			4
Returned to Puerto Rico					3*	1	4
Dropped out							
contact		1	1			1	
contact lost	1			1		2	7
Family refused	1	1	1		1		4
Subtotal	2	4	3	2	4	4	19
Total	5	5	5	5	5	5	30

*One of these boys first dropped out of high school his freshman year, worked a while, then returned to Puerto Rico.

APPENDIX B

Language Study
by
Artha Sue Loy, Ph.D.

Many Puerto Rican students in Chicago face the same educational problems as do other Spanish speaking students in schools across the United States. According to a recent study (Lucas, 1970) dropout rates are high, age-grade retardation occurs frequently, and achievement scores are low when compared with national norms. Cited often as a major source of these problems is lack of knowledge of English. But how much does this actually contribute to the educational problems of Puerto Ricans? In an attempt to answer this question, English competence and usage among Puerto Rican youths in lower track classes was investigated for the linguistic study of the Chicago Puerto Rican Project.

Methodology

Spontaneous speech samples, class essays, and responses to oral and written tests were analyzed to determine English capabilities of Puerto Rican youths in Chicago. During the first phase of the study (April-September 1969), oral and written tests to measure English competence and a language attitude and usage questionnaire were developed and administered to two classes of lower track eighth grade students and two classes of medium tract seventh grade students at The Grammar School in Chicago.

Two types of tests were devised for the study. For Test I, students were asked to judge grammaticality of English sentences containing two types of deviations from Standard English:

(1) deviations requiring knowledge of principles of sentence formation to detect, and

(2) deviations involving differences occurring in nonstandard dialects.

A native speaker would not utter sentences of type (1) and would immediately identify them as deviant, e.g., The child is very talking. But he might use sentences of the second type if his dialect was not Standard English, e.g., I haven't got nothing to do. Sentences of Standard English were also included in the test.

For Test II, students were asked to produce sentences incorporating the same grammatical features as those in the sentences they had been asked to evaluate in Test I.

Tests I and II distinguish language competence and language performance of a speaker. Competence is the mastery of the rules underlying sentence construction (such as the passive rule) for a particular language; performance is the way in which the speaker uses the rules. Because competence is not reflected directly in production, it is important to recognize the competence-performance distinction in assessing capabilities of second language learners, whose inability to articulate certain phonemes of the second language or whose use of nonstandard forms in production may lead teachers or researchers to assume lack of competence.

As a partial measure of accuracy of the tests, students' scores were compared with their teachers' evaluations of their knowledge of English, considered independently of their English grades or their overall academic standing. Test items which seemed to most clearly indicate competence in English were selected for the final version of the tests. Several items on the language attitude and usage questionnaire were reworded and several items were added.

During the field study of the project (September 1969-January 1970) the tests were administered to 175 students in two lower and two middle tract eighth grade classes at The Grammar School. The classes participating in the study also wrote two essays especially for the project. After the testing, recorded interviews were conducted with 20 of the students, selected to represent a cross sample of the group. Factors considered in selecting this sample were performance on written tests, birthplace, length of time spent in Chicago and age of migration for island-born students, and the teachers' evaluation of the students' ability to speak English without considering grammatical "correctness." The interviews were transcribed and analyzed according to recent linguistic theory.

Results

I. English Abilities and Characteristics Among Puerto Rican Youth in Chicago.

Responses to the tests and fluency in interview situations indicate the Puerto Rican students participating in the study know underlying principles of English sentence formation. On the test of competence, the students generally made the same judgments concerning grammaticalness of sentences that native speakers of English would make. Nearly all nonstandard sentences produced by students for Test II differed from Standard English in features occurring regularly enough to be categorized as dialectal. Students interviewed were able to understand and produce novel sentences and to converse freely with the investigator.

Although these results indicate most of the Puerto Rican students in the study do possess the capabilities of native speakers of English, differences exist between Standard English and their speech. Specification of these differences and their sources is important; otherwise, regularly occurring differences due to dialectal variety or influence of Spanish may be easily mistaken for lack of knowledge of English.

The most widespread nonstandard features of English which occur in responses to tests and interviews with Puerto Rican students in the sample are:

(1) reduction of final consonant clusters, especially those which do not occur in Spanish,

(2) the deletion of /s/ in certain environments, most noticeably in the third singular verb form,

(3) the deletion of it and is in certain expressions,

(4) the use of the double negative with indefinite pronouns, and

(5) the use of verb forms, especially ain't, don't, seen, corresponding to usage in nonstandard dialects North American English.

Consonant Cluster Reduction: -ed Past Suffix

The past tense suffix, -ed, phonetically /t/, /d/, or /əd/ in Standard English is deleted in speech and in writing by many speakers of Puerto Rican English.

(1) I was in the front room...so I look to see if my mother was watching...I pick up my littlest baby sister. (MF-PR)

(2) But the way you scream at us today it look like you were going to explode. (MB-PR)

(3) When I was small a lot of nice things happen to me. (MF-PR)

(4) It embarrass me when I went on the stage. (LM-PR)

Some students do not delete final /t/ and /d/ consistently.

(5) Another thing that happen in grammar school was I had been appointed... (MP-PR)

(6) I remember when I graduated...I travel a lot...I remember when I ask the judge...My wife had twins. I name them Stephen and Johnny. (DM-PR)

(7) When I graduated...we were goint to get married...I loved him...I looked like an elephant...all the dumb things that happen to me. (RS-PR)

(8) So I move...I started to like it...I went to The Grammar School. (MF-PR)

Sentences (1) - (8) and other data collected for the study indicate that the /t/ and /d/ forms of the past suffix seem to be deleted most often when the verb ends in one of the consonants /l, m, n, k, z, s/. Deletion of the past morpheme following these consonants prevents the occurrence of consonant combinations such as /ld, mk, nk, kt, zd, st/, which do not occur in Spanish and which might be difficult for a native speaker of Spanish to pronounce. This interpretation is supported by the fact that deletion of the past suffix occurs most frequently in the data among speakers who have learned English as a second language.

The /əd/ past form is usually not deleted because it does not produce difficult consonant clusters due to the presence of the vowel /ə/. In fact, some students who delete /t/ and /d/ forms of the past suffix sometimes replace them with the /əd/ form, e.g., bended /bɛndəd/.

Additional evidence that the deletion of the /t/ and /d/ past forms is not syntactic is that even in slow, deliberate speech, speakers delete /t/ or /d/ following consonants in words other than verbs.

(9) We read about Worl War II. (FE-PR)

(10) I didn' know that. (GB-PR)

(11) One thing I don' like... (CB-PR)

(12) They sen' a note to my ol' man.

(13) You raise your han' an' he yell at you. (RM-N.Y., PR)

Further evidence that the deletion of the past suffix is phonetic is provided by results of the competence tests. In the written judgments of grammaticality, some students who delete final /t/ and /d/ in speech indicated that *Last year Maria lived in Puerto Rico* would be uttered by an excellent speaker and others specified that *Last Saturday I wanted to go to a dance* was correct. This phenomenon illustrates the importance of distinguishing competence and performance in determining linguistic capabilities.

Noun Plural and Third Singular Deletion

Many speakers of Puerto Rican English delete the final /s/ or /z/ suffixes including those representing the noun plural or third singular verb morphemes.

(14) She look fat. (RR-PR)

(15) Lucy speak English to the baby. (CM-PR)

(16) My father make me stay home. (JU-PR)

(17) She learn English from her brother. (LR-PR)

(18) I know Eddie love me. (EC-PR)

(19) Hector read a lot. (PG-PR)

Some students who delete the plural suffix for regular nouns, have generalized regular plural forms of Standard English irregular plural nouns.

(20) I know the answer--"foots." (JC-PR)

(21) I know more about mens than you do. (CR-PR)

(22) The Horsemens, they seen it happen. (CC-PR)

Although deletion of the third singular morpheme might be attributed to interference of Spanish syntax, deletion of the noun plural /s/ cannot because Spanish plural forms of nouns are formed by addition of an /s/ morpheme, just as in English. It is likely that the noun plural and third person singular verb morphemes are deleted by a phonetic rule which is probably due to the influence of a phonetic rule deleting /s/ in certain environments in Puerto Rican Spanish. The /t/ and /d/ deletion rule probably applies to final /s/ and /z/ as well, although from data available, it is not possible to specify the exact form of the rule.

Again, what might seem to be a syntactic phenomenon can be attributed to a phonetic rule.

Is-deletion

The deletion of is occurs only after the words that and it in the data compiled for the study.

(24) That nice. (CM-PR)

(25) ...and that to long. (RR-PR)

(26) That what I like about her. (MH-PR)

(27) And that all my future. (MM-PR)

(28) And that the way you learn how to read. (MG-PR)

The deletion of is in Puerto Rican English maybe analyzed as resulting from the reduction of consonant clusters and predicted by the same rule which reduces final /t/, /d/, /z/ and /s/ to null following a consonant.

I do not (don't) see you.

He will not (won't) come.

Puerto Rican speakers follow the same rule despite the fact that the negative occurs before the verb in Spanish. *(Ella no esta enferma.)*

I didn't go to school there.

I don't speak my English so good. (CM-PR)

The Peewees don't hang out on that corner. (CR-PR)

I don't like to read with the group. (FE-PR)

I don't like to take the spelling tests. (FE-PR)

On the judgments of grammaticality, only two students marked the Spanish negative pattern correct (*I no drink coffee*), but one of these students wrote the standard form on the production test: *I do not drink coffee.* No one marked *Sara not is going* as correct on the judgment test; all students changed it to *Sara is not going* on the production test.

Negative + Indefinite

Whenever the negative occurs after the verb in sentences with indefiniate pronouns, or quantifiers, additional rules are required in Standard English. The quantifier some becomes any in a negative environment.

Negative + I have some money. ---→ I don't have any money.

Negative + I lost something. ---→ I didn't lose anything.

Negative + I hit someone. ---→ I didn't hit anyone.

If the negative occurs before the verb, it is placed on the first indefinite pronoun in Standard English.

Nobody will come.

Nothing is broken.

If the negative does not occur before the verb, as in Nobody will come, it may occur after the verb (as with the ordinary negative sentence pattern) or it may occur on the indefinite pronoun.

I cannot see anything or I can see nothing.

I did not lose anything or I lost nothing.

The Puerto Rican and North American speakers in the study use contractions whenever possible in their speech, causing that is and it is to be converted to /ðætz/ (that's) and /itz/ (it's) in surface structure. The application of the contraction rule to that is and it is produces the phonetic sequences /tz/ which does not occur in Spanish. Native speakers of Spanish could be expected to have difficulty pronouncing this consonant combination, especially if it occurs before a word beginning with a consonant (as in "24" and "28" above), yielding a cluster of three consonants.

Speakers who delete is following that and it do not delete it in other environments. This provides additional evidence that deletion of is is probably a phonetic rather than a syntactic phenomenon.

(29) That why I think.... She is like a parent.... You think school is a joke. (GR-PR)

(30) And that how my daydreaming happen.... She is not in my school.... A girl I like is in my class. (RM-PR)

(31) That why I don't want to be anything big. (GR-PR)

It-deletion

Speakers of Puerto Rican English delete it in the expressions I like it...and it is....

(32) I like when we go on a trip. (MH-PR)

(33) I like when I go to the assembly. (BL-PR)

(34) I don't like when we get rules. (MN-PR)

(35) ...because is an easy job. (CH-PR)

(36) I hope is nottoo bad. (FR-PR)

(37) Right now is big problem. ...where is safe for me. (OC-PR)

(38) If a teacher gets you in trouble, is because you done something. (GR-PR)

The deletion of it and is in these expressions is probably due to the influence of Spanish *Me gusta cuando*..., and *Es*....

Negative

In Standard English, the negative element occurs regularly after the verbal element bearing the tense marker.

In Puerto Rican English dialect, the negative occurs after the verb as well as with the indefinite.

They ain't gonna' do nothin' to you.

I don't listen to nobody.

Don't say nothin' bad to your mother.

He didn't want nothin' to do with Spanish.

These forms are also found in nonstandard dialects of native speakers of English.

The findings from the conversational analyses, the written essays, and the production test are supported by the judgments of grammaticality were 53% of the students indicated *I don't have nothing to do* was acceptable.

The other widely used nonstandard verb form is ain't.

(52) I ain't a chicken. (FE-PR)

(53) You ain't gonna' git by with it. (MB-NA)

(54) They ain't here. (HC-PR)

(55) They ain't lookin' for trouble. (DR-PR)

(56) They ain't gonna' do nothin' to you. (FB-NA)

The use of seen, don't and ain't, characteristic of many nonstandard dialects of English, is probably a neighborhood dialectal feature of the North American native speakers which has been incorporated into Puerto Rican English.

II. Language Usage and Attitude Among Puerto Rican Youth in Chicago.

The second phase of the field study involved determining patterns of language usage and attitude within the Puerto Rican community and the general linguistic background of the students participating in the study. For purposes of analysis, the students were classified into eight groups based on the following variables: sex, native language (English-Spanish), birthplace (Puerto Rican-Chicago). These groups were generally insignificant in the analysis, as the discussion of the results will indicate.

Language Attitude

Responses to the questionnaire suggest several generalizations concerning language usage and attitude among Puerto Rican youth participating in the study. First, the attitude of the Puerto Rican students and their parents toward learning English is favorable. All the students said Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rican should learn English. Eighty-two percent said their parents believe it is important for them to know English; 91% said their friends believe it is important to know English.

The students believe it is important to know English to get along in the United States. Only 21% said they thought they could get along without it; 100% said they thought people (Puerto Ricans and others) living in the United States should learn English even if they could get along without knowing it.

Second, the Puerto Rican students feel that learning other languages is an asset. All said people should learn the language when they move to another country; 86% said English speaking people in the United States should learn other languages, and 86% reported that English speaking people in the Puerto Rican neighborhood should learn Spanish. All the students said they want their children to speak both English and Spanish well.

The Puerto Rican students do not seem to equate retention of language and retention of ethnicity. Although 78% said they thought Puerto Ricans and other people who move to other countries should keep their customs, only 52% reported that people are not as likely to retain their own ethnic traditions and customs if they learn the language of the new country.

Language Usage

Responses to the language usage portion of the questionnaire indicate the Puerto Rican students speak English among themselves in nearly every domain: church, club meetings, joking, telling secrets, discussing problems, counting, praying, cursing, thinking, solving problems, daydreaming, memorizing, etc. Eighty-two percent speak English with with their brothers and sisters, regardless of sex, age, and birth order; 100% reported they speak English with their friends.

The major exception to the consistent use of English among Puerto Rican youths is the use of Spanish at home with their parents. Sixty-five percent reported they speak Spanish at home with their mothers; 50% said they speak Spanish with their fathers.

Field observations of students and their activities support these generalizations concerning language usage. Students appear to speak English to each other nearly all the time. Graffiti on buildings and writing on the blackboard at the Project Center, as well as a letter written to the Disciples and displayed on the bulletin board, were all written in English. Even the local "clubs" or gangs have English names: Latin Disciples, Horsemen, Peewees, Latin Kings, etc. Parents and youths in the community report that the younger people do not speak Spanish, which they regret. Many students who do speak Spanish claim their Spanish is "bad."

Verb: Nonstandard Usage of Irregular Past Tense

Speakers of Puerto Rican English in Chicago, including those who regularly delete the regular past tense suffix, tend to use standard irregular past forms.

(39) I thought it was the biggest thing. (DM-PR)

(40) ...and got into a lot of fights. (MF-PR)

(41) When the years went on I became a doctor and lost a lot of patients. (RS-PR)

(42) I kept going to my old room and the teacher thought I was sick. (MR-PR)

An exception is the widespread use of seen as a past form of see, used consistently by the members of the study including North Americans and island- and mainland-born Puerto Ricans.

(43) I seen him. (MB-PR)

(44) I never seen more than twelve members. (CR-PR)

(45) I seen them outside my house. (FE-PR)

(46) The Horsemens, they seen it happen. (CC-PR)

(47) I never seen him. (LM-PR)

Two other nonstandard verb forms occur regularly in the neighborhood speech. One is the widespread use of don't as a third singular present form of do.

(48) She don't scream at us. (MB-NA)

(49) He don't like it. (CC-PR)

(50) She don't need glasses. (FB-NA)

(51) He don't go for two weeks. (MC-NA)

Summary and Conclusions

The study of English capabilities and usage and attitude among Puerto Rican youth in Chicago indicates a strong trend exists toward native fluency and usage of English in nearly all domains. Although many Puerto Ricans speak Standard English, many speak a dialect incorporating features of both the North American neighborhood dialect and Spanish. These findings suggest that educational problems encountered by Puerto Rican students cannot be assumed to be caused by lack of fluency in English, and that intensive or special programs to develop fluency in English as a second language as distinguished from reading and writing skills) are not the sole answer to the students' problems.

These generalizations are supported by the teachers interviewed at The Grammar School and by the principal, who said, when told the results of the study, "That's what I always thought."

Language Attitude Questionnaire

Name ______________________________

1. Where were you born? ______________________________

2. If you were not born in the United States, how old were you when you came here? ____________________

3. What language or languages did you speak when you came to the United States? ______________________________

4. If you spoke English when you came to the United States, how had you learned it?

   _____ A. Studied English in school.

   _____ B. Spoke English at home.

   _____ C. Spoke English with friends.

   _____ D. Spoke English at work.

   _____ E. Other. (Please explain.) ____________________

5. What was the first language you spoke? ____________________

6. How old were you when you began to speak a second language? _____

7. What languages have you studied in school? ________________

   A. Were these studies in the United States, or in Puerto Rico, etc.? ____________________

8. What language or languages are you studying now in school? ______ ______________________________

   A. Why are you studying this particular language or languages?
   _____ Required _____ Want to learn this language

9. In addition to English, what language or languages do you speak? ______________________________

10. What languages do you understand? ____________________

11. What languages do you read? ______________________________

12. What languages do you write? ______________________________

13. What language do your parents usually speak with each other? ______________________________

14. What language do you usually speak with your father? ______________

15. What language do you usually speak with your mother? ______________

16. What language do you usually speak with your brothers and sisters? ______________________________

17. What language do you usually speak with your friends when you are not in school? ___________________________

18. Do you believe that Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico should learn languages other than Spanish? ____________

19. Do you believe that English-speaking people in the United States should learn other languages? ____________

20. Do you believe that English-speaking people in your neighborhood should learn Spanish? ________________

A. If so, why? ____

B. If not, why not? ____

21. Do you believe that someone who moves to another country should learn the language spoken there even if he can get along without knowing it? ______________________________

22. Do you believe that Puerto Ricans living in the United States should learn English? ________________

A. If so, why? (You may mark more than one.)

_____ To get good jobs
_____ To be able to listen to the radio
_____ To be able to read a newspaper
_____ To be able to enjoy TV and movies
_____ To be able to read books
_____ To be able to write letters
_____ To be able to talk with people who do not know Spanish
_____ To be important
_____ Other reasons. (Please explain.) _____________________

23. Do your parents consider it important for you to be able to speak English? ________________________________

24. Can your parents speak English? ________

25. If your parents do not speak English, are they trying to learn? ____

26. If not, do they want to learn? ____________

27. How many grades of school did your mother finish? ________________

28. How many grades of school did your father finish? ________________

29. Do your friends consider it important to be able to speak English? ________________________________

30. Do you believe you could get along in the United States without knowing English? ________________________

A. Why or why not? ____

31. Do you believe you should learn English even if you could get along without it? ______________________________

A. Why or why not? ____

32. Do you want your children to learn to speak English well? __________

33. Do you believe that people such as Puerto Ricans who move to another country should try to keep their own customs and way of life? ______

34. If these people learn the language spoken in the new country, do you think they might not be as likely to keep their own customs? _______

35. Do you believe that some people learn languages more easily than others? ________________________________

36. Do you believe that you learn languages easily? ________________

37. How well do you feel that you know English (based on your ability to talk with people and understand them--not your grades in English class).

_____ Not very well

_____ Well

_____ Fairly well

_____ Very well

38. Do you think that you can improve much more in English? ___________

39. If you do not speak English well now, do you think you might be able to someday? ______________________

40. Which skills are hardest for you? (You may mark more than one.)

_____ Speaking English

_____ Writing English

_____ Reading English

_____ Understanding conversations or instructions in English

42. Do you enjoy studying English? ____________

A. If not, why not? ____

43. Do you feel that you learn more English in class or in conversation with English speakers? ____

44. How would you change the English courses in school? ______________

____

45. Do you ever find that other classes are difficult because you do not understand English? ________________________

A. How often does this happen? ______________________________

46. Do you think school would be easier if you knew English better? _____

47. Would school be easier if lessons were given in English and Spanish? ___________________________________